FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report
Supplement

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-126S
Thursday
30 June 1988

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT

FBIS-SOV-88-126 *30 June 1988*

CONTENTS

19th CPSU CONFERENCE

More on First Day's Proceedings, Speeches 1
Bakatin Opens Debate 1
Kirov Kolkhoz Chief Motornyy 1
Kazakhstan's Kolbin Speaks 2
Moscow Gorkom's Belyaninov 3
Yakovlev Reads Delegate Note 3
Belyaninov Hand-Clapped Off *[PRAVDA 29 Jun]* 3
Abalkin Addresses Conference *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 4
Chazov, Yakovlev Speak 7
Further on Chazov Address *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 8
Masaliyev Criticizes Press *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 11
Yakovlev News Briefing Reported *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 13
Second Day Conference Proceedings Reported 13
29 Jun Speakers Listed 13
Razumovskiy Credentials Report *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 14
Kalashnikov Criticizes Progress *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 16
Karpov on 'Brawling' Criticism *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 19
Speeches Summarized 21
Leningrad Worker Smirnov Speech *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 22
Arbatov, Zaykov Speak 23
Arbatov Favors Two Terms for All 25
Azerbaijan's Vezirov Urges Ethnic Ministry *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 25
Ulyanov, Gorbachev Exchange 28
Kachura Addresses Conference 30
Fedotova Discusses Education 31
Marchuk Addresses Session 31
Urges Freedom in Science 32
Armenia's Arutyunyan Speaks 32
More on Armenian Official's Address 34
Sokolov Conference Speech 34
Bondarev: 'Extremist Criticism' 35
Komsomol Leader Speaks 35
Ivanovo Director's Speech 36
Pugo Speech to Conference 39
Evening Session Concludes 39
Gorbachev Speaks at Closing 40
Uzbekistan Delegate Holds News Conference 40
Press Briefed on Conference Proceedings 41
Volkogonov Speaks at Conference Press Center *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 30 Jun]* 41
Armenian Delegates Hold News Conference 42
Party Conference Resumes Work 30 Jun 42
Gorbachev, Delegate Debate 42
More on Debate 43
Gorbachev 'Invitation to Dialogue' Welcomed *[IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]* 44
Conference Delegates, Guests Interviewed *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 46
Writers Denounce 'Establishment' Speakers 47

Businesslike Spirit Seen at Conference 48
New Sakhalin Oblast Group Attends Conference 48
Yazov Receives Military Delegates to Conference 48
Zaykov Comments on Restructuring, Conference *[Budapest NEPZABADSAG 27 Jun]* 48
Moscow Gorkom Plenum Seen as 'Dress Rehearsal' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 24]* 51
'Controversial' Conference Demands Published *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 52
Roy Medvedev on CPSU Conference Prospects *[Barcelona LA VANGUARDIA 22 Jun]* 53

More on First Day's Proceedings, Speeches

Bakatin Opens Debate

LD2906155988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] As has been reported, the debate at the all-union CPSU Conference was opened by Comrade Bakatin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and Kemerovo Obkom first secretary. Discussion of the Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference has been fruitful, he said. Communists and nonparty members and people of various professions, ages, and destinies have made 75,000 proposals. The overwhelming majority of labor collectives in the Kuzbass believe restructuring must be measured by what is achieved and only by what is achieved. The speaker went on to dwell on the conclusion in the report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev: The need to accelerate the switch from democratizing the management of enterprises to democratizing the management of industries. The delegate spoke of the need to relieve enterprises from diktats by ministries and departments. Overcoming management methods involving the issuing of injunctions and commands from the center is proceeding slowly and inconsistently. This situation has a particular effect on the distribution of funds and on contacts between enterprises and local soviets. It was proposed that a switch to forming local budgets on social grounds be started as of next year.

The speaker supported the clauses in the report by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, saying that the election of first secretaries of obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms should be put to a secret ballot before becoming chairmen of the appropriate local soviets. That gives an effective opportunity for dual control over the activity of party and local soviet organs and of each specific leader, in the view of the delegate. The party has nothing to hide from the masses nor is there anywhere for it to work other than among the masses.

In returning more and more in practice to the Leninist understanding of the essence of socialism, we, said the speaker, must to the same degree return to the Leninist understanding of the party's role which in being transformed, developed, and restrucured must remain the political leader of the masses.

The speaker went on to dwell in detail on the need for more effective use of scientific developments for determining priorities in developing areas like the Kuzbass. While playing a large role in the country's economy, they do not always have precise and scientifically founded pointers for their progress and that hinders a quicker increase of their economic and social potential.

Kirov Kolkhoz Chief Motornyy

LD2906154188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] An hour ago, the evening session of the 1st day of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference began. We have learned that more than 100 people put their names down on the list of speakers at the start of the debate. There was no pre-prepared list, and we heard the name of the first speaker only when he was announced from the conference rostrum. This was Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin, Kemerovo Obkom first secretary.

The first secretary was very animinated because he was speaking about a problem which has come to a head: What is hampering progress. However strange it may appear, he said, in the period of glasnost, it is primarily the lack of glasnost from central bodies that hampers progress. The remarks by Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin on the need to liberate enterprises from the influence of the center were universally supported by delegates. This has still not come about. As an initial measure, the delegate proposed that the squeezing of enterprises by the state order should end; these are his words I am quoting. Otherwise, if a ministry continues to influence enterprises, then local soviets, too, will not get real power. After all, one of the main results of the conference should be a decision to strengthen the power of the soviets.

The well-founded view is expressed, that a first secretary—if such is the decision of the conference—should be elected chairman of a soviet. That is democratic. If the soviet does not elect him chairman or does not express confidence, then he must vacate the post of first secretary. Unite in order to fix the boundaries [obedinitsaya chtoby razmezhevatsya] is how the delegate concluded his thought.

There was also discussion in his speech about the creation of a party budget in local areas and on the timeframe for re-electing party leaders. If he does not cope with his business, then perhaps he should be dismissed.

Then Dmitriy Nikolayevich Motornyy, chairman of the Kirov Kolkhoz from Kherson Oblast, went to the rostrum. He spoke about the problems which are now concerning all agricultural workers, all rural workers. Here is an excerpt from his speech:

[Begin Motornyy recording] Sometimes we complain that we do not have many good products. But at the same time, individual workers, kolkhoz workers, and scientists do not want to work well. We now see another trend: good work, but fabulously high wages which are three or four times the quantity and quality of the work involved. Both are bad. We do not know how to use objective economic laws, especially the law on distribution according to labor, and this is an enormous mistake by economists.

The science of economics is still producing recommendations by the trial and error method. Nowadays economists and financial experts are defining for themselves in their work the main areas: to devise the norms for deductions from profit, and to devise them in such a way that the greater the profit, then the greater the deductions. This, of course, does not help increase labor productivity and productiveness, conversion coefficients, wage funds, and numbers of staff. In this way, economic levers are in practice turning into brakes. It is possible to wrest from the apparatchiks the right to command—the kolkhozes, for example—which they have usurped—and I am firmly convinced of this—only if the economy is democratized. It should be a law that only those who actually earn money should be able to have it at their disposal.

In a word, without scientifically based norms and deductions for the budget and centralized funds, we will not ensure the normal functioning of the economic mechanism in the new conditions. The distortions which have been permitted must be corrected without delay. [end recording]

You were listening to an excerpt from the speech by Dmitriy Konstantinovich [as heard] Motornyy, chairman of the Kirov Kolkhoz from Kherson Oblast.

Gennadiy Vasiliyevich Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee and Valeriy Konstantinovich Belyaninov of the Moscow Gorkom also spoke today. The debate is continuing. With this we end our report from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Kazakhstan's Kolbin Speaks

LD2806201388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 28 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report on speech by Gennadiy Vasilyevich Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, at the 19th CPSU conference in Moscow on 28 June—portions within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] [Kolbin] "Preparations for the current conference took place under unusual circumstances. The stormy process of the development of democracy, and the revolutionary spirit of the CPSU Central Committee theses awoke society's forces. Their thrust broke through the barrier of the people's silent indifference and patient voicelessness. Everyone has started speaking loudly and freely at once. Workers and writers, peasants and students, party and economic officials started speaking about sore problems, about what affects the vital interests of each separate individual and of society as a whole. During the period of preparation for the conference, glasnost showed an essential positive feature. It has become constructive and is aiming at correcting specific deformities of social development."

[Announcer] The speaker also noted positive changes which have taken place in the republic recently: the housing and food situations have improved and more social and cultural amenities have been built. Nevertheless, there is still a lot of work ahead, and people need visible changes.

[Kolbin] "Under the conditions of developing democracy, people's activity has been growing, and so-called informal leaders have been emerging. They often put forward just demands and pose very important and acute questions, thereby uniting around themselves those who advocate a higher pace of restructuring. Yet quite often we see in the activities of these leaders examples of going over the top, of maximalism, and of loss of contact with reality in the measures they suggest for solving various problems—and sometimes even open attacks on party and soviet bodies. This category of people requires the close attention of leaders of various levels and all Communists. Our task is to support in every possible way their noble striving for accelerating changes while directing it into the proper channel.

"There are other, I would say, pseudoleaders, among whom are people with party membership cards in their pockets. They deliberately confuse the public by suggesting obviously hare-brained ideas and try to substitute rabid anarchy for democracy. The irresponsible ones talk, for example, about immediately closing all the enterprises whose activity is, in some way or another, affecting the ecological situation. This can evoke nothing but indignation. Is it a constructive and realistic appraoch? And what can the organizers of all sorts of rallies and demonstrations, which often are little more than empty talk, offer to people specifically? In their uncontrolerable ambitions, all those defenders of rights and freedoms somehow forget about another important side of democracy, which is the citizen's responsibility to society. In their declarations, they do not stimulate the people's interest in the need to strengthen labor and production discipline; on the contrary, they pander to those who stage strikes and thwart plans for our acceleration. No, those people do not assist restructuring; rather, they hamper it and put a brake on it.

"Comrades! In the conditions of a multinational republic, work with creative intelligentsia acquires particular importance. For it is precisely the intelligentsia which is the bearer of the ideas of national awareness; it is precesely they who have an active influence on its shaping. We must also take into account the fact that this is a group where discussions and arguments occur particularly often. Quite often the representatives of the intelligentsia come up with sharp wordings which wound the self-esteem of certain workers who, instead of looking into the heart of the matter, try to suppress any kind of different opinion [inakomysliye]. We should not be afraid of discussions."

[Announcer] The speaker emphasized the need for uniting in the name of solving the complex tasks which are facing our society now.

[Kolbin] "I think that we should take pains to guard the party's prestige against all sorts of deserved and undeserved attacks which have started to emerge sometimes. Now that restructuring requires everyone to sharply change their practical activity, we are in absolute need of comradely cohesion. Let us recall what Lenin said: A decision adopted by the entire party is tantamount to a word we have given ourselves voluntarily. Remaining true to this behest of Lenin's, we must now merge together and assert a clean and benevolent moral atmosphere among party ranks."

Moscow Gorkom's Belyaninov

LD2906153988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 28 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Valeriy Konstantinovich Belyaninov, secretary of Moscow Gorkom [title as heard], reported that during the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses over 130,000 proposals and additions were voiced in party organizations and the city's labor collectives. These became the Moscow delegation's mandate. They contain support for the party's course toward further developing perestroyka, toward deepening economic reform over the entire front, and toward boldly reconstructing the political system.

All of us, each party organization, will have to persistently learn to act according to the laws of the political vanguard. This, as the capital's experience shows, is not learned easily. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0500 GMT on 29 June in a similar report adds: "Outmoded methods have not yet been completely eliminated. Like a drop of water, Moscow reflects all the diversity and contradictions of our lives. It was indeed from here that the impetus for change came. From the first days, restructuring has relied on the working class of the capital. But the old problems remained. The city gorkom is working persistently to get rid of shortcomings and is overcoming complacency, the habit of overemphasizing successes, and avoiding problems.

"In many spheres emerging from stagnation is turning out to be no simple matter. As is well known, during the first stage of restructuring there were attempts to eliminate sluggishness and indecision [oblomovshchina] at a stroke, using revolutionary talk and hurried reshuffling of cadres. The CPSU Central Committee and the Communists of the town have condemned such approaches which are not in accordance with the meaning of restructuring, since it is impossible to achieve this merely by issuing slogans and instructions without broad participation by the masses. The atmosphere in the city's gorkom is today becoming increasingly healthy and comradely. The political maturity of Communists and purposeful work by collectives have made it possible to safeguard stable progress along the path of intensifying the economy. But as yet there has been no radical turning point. Party management of the economic sphere must be improved while resolutely rejecting the old methods."]

Comrade Belyaninov dwelled in detail on how the Moscow Gorkom is exerting leadership of perestroyka in various spheres of the capital's economic and social life.

[Begin Belyaninov recording] A new general plan for the management of Moscow's economy has been drawn up, which envisages a differentiation [razgranicheniye] of the functions of local soviet and economic bodies [applause], greater independence of the rayon unit, raising the responsibility of the rayispolkom [applause] for the comprehensive development of the territories under their jurisdiction. [sustained applause]

The conference will provide our party with clear, precisely adjusted guidelines. There is only one right it won't give us communists—to work at half throttle, half-heartedly, to indulge in wishful thinking, and to stop half-way. Only by deeds and strenuous work, will we justify the Soviet people's trust. [end recording]

Yakovlev Reads Delegate Note

LD2806224088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Following Comrade Belyaninov's speech, Comrade Yakovlev, who chaired the evening session, addressed the delegates:

[Begin recording] [Yakovlev] Comrades, the following note has arrived in the Presidium: Would the speakers please speak only in keeping with the agenda and stop giving accounts...[interrupted by applause] Just a minute... [applause continues] But I have not finished reading the note [laughter] ...accounts of self-praise during the course of discussion of the Theses. This takes a lot of time. Signed Delegate (Chekanets).

I think the comrades will take this request of the delegates to the conference.

[Unidentified speaker] Which was supported by the conference.

[Yakovlev] Yes, supported by the conference, yes. [end recording]

Belyaninov Hand-Clapped Off

PM2906111988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 88 Second Edition p 7

[Special correspondents V. Kozhemyako, V. Loginov, Yu. Makhrin, G. Ovcharenko, and S. Pastukhov report: "Course of Restructuring. PRAVDA Special Correspondents Report From the Kremlin Palace of Congresses"]

[Excerpts] The range of matters facing the delegates to the 19th all-union party conference is wide and the plans are major. One is struck by the fact that even outwardly

the conference looks like a business meeting, a meeting of businesslike people—without the previously usual ostentation, bustling pomp, or anniversary clamor. True, we did meet many long-standing acquaintances in the palace who, "by virtue of their position," had not missed a single important event here. However, we also met many people whom one could tell at first glance had never been to the Kremlin before....

"This is my first-ever visit to Moscow," T. Nesterenko, milking machine operator from the Kuybyshev Kolkhoz in Lebedinskiy Rayon, Sumy Oblast, said. [passage omitted]

"I listened attentively to Comrade Gorbachev's report," she said. "Of course, my comrades and I will make every effort to produce more food for the country. But, on the other hand, my fellow-villagers asked me to find out when we will be allocated...gas pipes. Not a question for the party? How else should it be viewed!... There is gas in the city, but we don't have any. Why are we worse than the city people?..."

All the delegates are people with their own problems and own lives which, one way or another, they measure against the program life of the entire country. [passage omitted]

We met with G. Yermakov, director of the "Severonikel" Combine in Monchegorsk, before the conference started. [passage omitted]

"The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's report revealed many problems which are causing the new economic mechanism to mark time. It is now a question of using this knowledge to solve problems," G. Yermakov concluded with conviction. "And we will solve them!"

"Is it true," V. Tregub, tunneler at "Kiyevmetrostroy" asked us, "that during the times of stagnation congress delegates were given collections of victorious reports from each republic, many oblasts, and dozens of enterprises? That there were no problems! It turns out that delegates were deliberately instructed to adopt a cheerful tone.... The situation at the conference is quite different. It is businesslike and there are no attempts to embellish the situation or smooth down sharp corners."

"M.S. Gorbachev's report," V. Yaglevskiy, director of the "Nizhnekolymskiy" Sovkhoz in Yakutsk, developed the same topic, "contained ideas held by millions of Communists and nonparty people. And this is a guarantee that we will really succeed in deepening restructuring. After the report and the first speeches I finally believe that the day of reckoning has arrived for those who are not restructuring themselves but merely tagging along, wrapping old methods up in new flags. Oh, how much some people still want to stifle initiative! As part of the struggle against people who masquerade at restructuring, we must stop 'dragging' into the center those issues which would be better solved locally." [passage omitted]

Professionalism.... Probably this feature more than any other distinguishes the conference from the many other party forums that we can still remember from the past. This was precisely the tone set by the report. The debate began in an equally businesslike and analytical tenor. The audience was short on applause. People concentrated on the speakers' trains of thought, following their logic, and attentively weighing up their proposals.

But when one of the speakers—V. Belyaninov, secretary of Moscow party gorkom—started straying from substantive issues, people started a slow hand-clap. Not in support of the speech, of course—it was a kind of protest against boring "waffle." And since the speaker was unable to get himself into step with the businesslike atmosphere, the applause grew until he left the rostrum. Finally, the chairman read out a note that had reached the presidium stating that people should not get sidetracked into self-justification or praise because this would waste too much time.

Yes, before mounting the rostrum the speakers now have to have a real think yet again. Bromides and general loud phrases will not be accepted by the delegates to the 19th all-union party conference!

Abalkin Addresses Conference

PM3006140588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition pp 3-4

["Speech by Comrade L.I. Abalkin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute" at the 28 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades! Allow me, in accordance with the standing orders and within the framework of the conference agenda, to dwell on three matters.

The first and perhaps key question that we have to answer is the elaboration of modern ideas of socialism, the updating of our ideas. All the other questions we have tackled, are tackling, and are yet to tackle hinge on clarity in this fundamental question. The actual elaboration of ideas about socialism is no simple matter. It requires immense effort. Once, when an effort was made to ascertain more clearly the ideas of the founders of our teaching about the future society and when the requests became particularly pressing, Engels liked to say that the people of the future "...will be no more stupid than we are." To what extent the great thinker's forecast was correct requires independent examination. But there are no ready recipes. We will not find, even when we read through all the classic works of Marxism-Leninism, ready answers to the questions posed by life. Otherwise it would be a religion, not a science.

Very important in this connection are the provisions set out in the report at the very end, talking about the elaboration of ideas about the new complexion of Soviet society that we are striving for. I believe this is not yet the final answer. It is only the start of an extensive discussion and, perhaps, it will take some years yet to think about and work on this.

I would also like to look at a fundamental factor. Socialism does not grow out of nothing. It is an inevitable stage in the development of human civilization. And it absorbs or, rather, it is meant to absorb all the best things accumulated by mankind's labor and intelligence in all past eras—in the spheres of technology, production organization, the cooperative movement, the exploitation of the market, the organization of democratic institutions, moral values, ethical norms, and so forth. And only by absorbing all this is it able to perform the role of leading force of social progress.

It is very important, when talking about socialism, to see not some completed design but its colossal diversity and the inevitable intricacy of its structures. This should warn us against attempts to construct designs, put everything possible into them beforehand, and obtain a ready answer.

I think the conference should adopt a decision and place at the center of our social science work the elaboration of the present-day concept of socialism.

The second matter concerns the assessment of the state of affairs in the economy and the course of the economic reform in view of the opinions expressed by representatives of economic science. That there have been positive changes in the economy cannot be denied. They have been mentioned in the report and, obviously, there is no need to dwell in detail on this. But it is important to make it emphatically clear that there has been no radical breakthrough in the economy and it has not emerged from a state of stagnation.

In the past 2 years the national income, which brings together the indicators of the country's economic and social development (I am employing the official data of the State Committee for Statistics), has grown at a slower rate than in the stagnation years of the 11th 5-Year Plan. Targets on an efficiency indicator of such major importance as resource-saving were not met. In the 2-year period it fell on average by 0.1 percent, whereas in the last, much criticized 5-year plan the annual reduction in materials-intensiveness was 0.5 percent.

Changes in the structure of social production—between groups "A" and "B" and between accumulation and consumption—took place in directly the opposite direction to that laid down by the 27th party congress. The consumer market situation has deteriorated. The situation in the scientific-technical progress sphere, where we are lagging further and further behind the world and the lag is becoming increasingly dangerous, is giving rise to particular anxiety.

Naturally, these assessments require analysis, to find out why this is happening and what economic science has to say about it. These questions were constantly cropping up during the debate before the party conference and were forever being put to us conference delegates. What does economic science think? It thinks, and, I believe, with every justification, that one cannot expect to be successful if one acts contrary to the objective logic of life, ignoring its laws.

I will take the liberty of digressing somewhat and quoting some words pronounced at the beginning of the last century by the outstanding Russian economist Nikolay Ivanovich Turgenev, who wrote: "It is the responsibility of those governing the state to have a thorough knowledge of political economy; and one can confidently say that any government that does not understand the rules of this science or has contempt for them is bound to suffer financial ruin." I think the years of the recent 5-year plans have been a graphic illustration of how correct these assessments were.

But when talking about the causes, it has to be said that we very often merely skate over the surface, reducing everything to resistance by the bureaucratic apparatus and certain officials. The causes are considerably deeper and more serious than that. We should start with the fact that when the 12th 5-Year Plan was being elaborated the concept of simultaneously ensuring quantitative growth and qualitative transformations was adopted. From the scientific viewpoint these tasks are incompatible. If anyone continues to doubt this, the first half of the 5-year plan confirms the correctness of this conclusion. It was necessary to choose: either quantity or quality. In view of our traditions and experience, the choice was clear.

It must be clearly understood—and this must also be reflected in our ideas, in our conclusions—that by continuing to opt for purely quantitative, volume economic growth we are unable to solve the problem of fundamentally improving output quality, retooling the national economy, and improving efficiency and we cannot turn the economy around toward the consumer.

Everything else hinges on the understanding of this question. We say: How can it be when there are such gaps in the national economy, when there are shortages all over the place, with this, that, and the other in short supply? Obviously, it is easier to say what we have enough of. Therefore we must increase volumes so that there are no scarcities. This is a fallacious idea, fundamentally fallacious, because quantitative volume growth aggravates rather than solves the shortage problem. The history of our development confirms this conclusion.

Hence the desire to use pressure to obtain definite results and cover 100-percent of the outpout volume with state orders. We are criticizing what has been done in 1988. But there is no certainty that it will all be rectified next year.

For example, we are proposing even now to incorporate 100 percent of retail trade turnover in the volume of state orders. What is the logic in that? The retail trade turnover situation is bad, the plan is not being fulfilled, money is not circulating—so it has to be incorporated in state orders.

What are the lessons of history? We have done everything on the basis of trade turnover: planned it, issued additional targets, and incorporated them in state orders. But in the past 17 years (and that is nearly one-fourth of the life of the Soviet state) the retail trade turnover plan has not been fulfilled on 15 occasions. So it is down to the system, and attempts to solve the problem by the old methods will not be successful. An entirely different system is needed, namely the one we agreed on 1 year ago, at the party Central Committee June Plenum, that is, a switch to economic methods of regulating economic relations.

Analysis further shows that one serious problem we are encountering today is an attempt to solve problems on the basis of purely organizational measures and decisions, in particular by increasing the number of decisions. We have this innate faith in the power of decrees and in the ability to change things using new resolutions. But this is not confirmed by experience.

We are currently planning substantial measures to reinvigorate the soviets and democratize public life. For example, how deputies are to be elected, from how many candidates, and so forth. But we have adopted a multitude of different decisions in the past. It is 5 years since we adopted the decision on the rights of the labor collective. Nothing has changed as a result of it. On several occasions we have adopted decisions on the rights of local soviets, and again nothing has changed. It must be clearly understood that changes do not occur as a result of decisions taken and that progress is measured not in the number of decrees, but in real change in basic economic relations. Success comes only when we actually change these relations. We began to change them this year by placing enterprises under new management conditions, and we can now look forward to real results.

And the final question relates to democratization problems. I repeat that it is necessary to have a very precise idea of how to elect deputies. Let us elect one from several candidates and then let us release them from work permanently or for periods so that they can sit there and solve our problems. And what are they? The deputies will tackle what has been tackled by the current soviets, but at greater length. It is necessary to change the actual economic conditions of the activity of soviets at all levels and give this authority a real economic foundation—a financial basis—and considerable room for maneuver. (applause) This requires independent examination. But what I want is for people to see second, third, and fourth questions when tackling a particular question. They are all interrelated. One cannot be separated from another. We will get nowhere by solving all these procedural questions without changing the economic conditions.

We are now talking (this is a very big qestion, evidently one of the chief questions) about the legal state. Of course, laws must be observed. But the legal state is only part of the civil society with its laws, relationships, and ties which are by no means all state relationships and which exist in various forms of associations, independent entities, and labor collectives' bodies. And, obviously, when elaborating the concept of a legal state, we must see the problem as an integral whole.

I will be more specific about the questions raised in the report. Of course they need to be analyzed, and 2 hours is not enough to evaluate all that was said. But to combine in one person the functions of party committee first secretary and soviet chairman raises serious questions. (applause) First of all, you will be electing the soviet chairman not from several deputies, but from one: the first secretary, in fact. It will only be a vote of confidence, not a choice from many options. I appreciate that a vote of confidence is very important. And it is unclear, anyway, how this fits in with the concept of delimiting the functions of party and soviet bodies. (applause) This requires some thought. It is a very serious question. Perhaps the final decisions must not be taken by the conference, perhaps it is good sense to continue the debate in connection with the upcoming refinement of the Constitution. Perhaps experiments should be conducted in several oblasts: After all, it is a very responsible matter to take such major decisions without a trial.

Last of all, we must not get bogged down in trivia. We know what kind of atmosphere there is surrounding the conference, what is expected of it. It is a very big question. Are we capable of ensuring the democratic organization of public life while preserving the soviet organization of society and the one-party system? Yes or no? And if so, how? Given the preservation of these principles and foundations, given the leading role of the party, given a one-party system, and given the soviet organization of society, it is necessary to ensure the widest possible opportunities for voicing opinions, exchanging views, and so forth.

It must be clearly understood that the expression of different approaches and alternative solutions is not a reflection of the existence of political opposition of various kinds. It is a reflection of the logic of social development, whereby there are in principle many variants. Development always has many variants, there is always a choice of solutions. Only in history, when we

look at the past, do we see an option that has actually been implemented. And it appears to us that it was all clearly predetermined. But, in fact, development essentially has many variants—of course, in the context of the general, global law of society's progress, economic and social. Ways and means have to be found of taking these factors into account, in including the role of science, in particular social science, which has already been criticized here today. And rightly criticized—it has very many shortcomings. For some years, for some decades now the social sciences have been criticized, and it will probably be some time yet before this "ugly duckling" turns into a beautiful swan. But it will happen and it must happen. So one must think about its place in the system of democratic institutions: to what extent it could act as a force opposing particular solutions proposed by the state, to what extent it acts an objector, as an expert in these matters, or proposes alternative options. Then, on the basis of this comparison, we will achieve a very great deal.

And now my very final word. When there is a choice from alternative options, the leadership functions as leader of society. If it has no options to choose from, it performs the function of amending drafts prepared by the apparatus. This is inevitable.

I believe that we are on the threshold of very big decisions. And it is necessary to approach their elaboration and adoption with the maximum scientific and political wisdom. (applause)

Chazov, Yakovlev Speak

LD2806191288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] The first working day of the 19th all-union party conference has ended. Soviet television and radio broadcast a relay from the Kremlin Hall of Congresses, where Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the general secretary of the Party Central Committee, delivered a report at the morning session on the process of the implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the tasks in deepening restructuring.

The Communists started debating the report. We have informed you in detail on how the debates are going. Seven people took part in them today. Comrades Chazov and Masaliyev were the last in this list. Addressing the participants, the minister of health and member of the CPSU Central Committee, said in particular:

[Begin Chazov recording] In the period of preparation for the party conference, a lot could be heard in speeches about concern for the fate of restructuring and openness, words about how there are forces and mechanisms putting a brake on this process. But I think, comrades, that our conference, and indeed the opinion of the whole Soviet people, show that we can no longer live in the old way, that the sole way out of the difficult situation in which the country found itself, the sole way to turn it into a socialist state flourishing not in slogans but in reality, is the way of renewing our society, economy, and social sphere.

Let us remember that for a long time we have been proclaiming: Everything for man, everything for his well-being. Until the 27th party congress this priority remained an ordinary slogan, unsupported by concrete deeds. I want to plead that they are speaking of the past. But the past is always indicative, because one must never repeat the mistakes of the past. As for how we regarded protecting the people in the past, we kept quiet, for example, about the fact we were in 50th place in the world for infant mortality, after Mauritius and Barbados. We were proud that we had more doctors and hospitals than any other country in the world, but we kept quiet about the fact that our life expectancy ranks 32d in the world. The Uzbek author Rashidov wrote about the happy children of a flourishing republic, but Rashidov, as leader of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, did absolutely nothing to save the 33,000 children who died every year before reaching their first birthday. Thousands of millions of roubles were squandered and (?torn up) in the republic. Yet 46 percent of the hospitals were located in buildings which were not up to the minimum sanitary and hygiene standards.

And to compare, now that the wind of renewal has arrived in Uzbekistan, 400 buildings built by party and government organizations have been handed over for health care, and we shall be able to install 10,000 beds, mainly for children.

Or taking something else: the BAM, the construction of the century. They built a station in Tynda of (?marble) and aluminium. Well, of course, it is a question of the country's prestige. But the fact that the rayon hospital in the town was located in a barracks building without any facilities—well, so what, comrades, delegations are going to go there.

Why take the BAM and Siberia? In the city of Moscow it took 11 years to build a hospital for invalids of the Fatherland War. I could cite you many examples of such things as I have been speaking about.

Now the word openness keeps coming up in speeches in the press, on the radio, on television. But by this we often understand only the freedom of speech guaranteed by our Constitution. Are we not devaluing this concept which is new to us? Are we not repeating the mistakes of the past when we forget the deeds behind the words? Openness today, comrades, is a lever for revealing the reasons and mechanisms of the braking process, and for working out, on this basis, ways to renew our country.

I would like to say that one of the examples of concrete (?realities) is the decision by the party Central Committee and the Council of Ministers on improving the health care of the Soviet people. The decision was published

last week. It must be said plainly that the path which led to the (?publication) of this decision was not easy. There were attempts, as in the past, to drown the essence of the problems in generalities, appeals, which were not backed up by constructive decisions. I must say plainly that only the firm policy of the Politburo, realistically recognizing the lag in the health-care sphere, made it possible to work out and adopt a constructive plan for improving health care, a plan backed up by material resources.

To imagine the scale of the restructuring confronting us, it suffices to point out that the allocations for current expenditure in the next 5-year plan are being doubled; and the volume of capital investment, from R9 billion in this 5-year plan will rise to R25 billion in the next. Whether this is a lot or a little, when last year the Politburo, taking account of the difficult situation in health care, despite the financial difficulties of our country, sought an additional R5.4 billion for health care, our friends—doctors in the United States—calculated that this was the cost of 3 cruisers or 125 antisubmarine helicopters.

This is why we doctors warmly welcome the disarmament which has begun. We are in favor of disarmament, and we hope that in the near future, health care will get in addition the cost, not perhaps of three cruisers, but at least of a few aircraft carriers or a few hundred missiles.

We understand that by resolving only financial and material and technical questions, one cannot fundamentally change the situation which has arisen in catering to the health of Soviet people. It is necessary to search for new systems of organization and management. It is necessary to root out sluggishness and bureaucracy, irresponsibility and callousness among medical workers.

But, respected comrades, unfortunately this malaise is, after all, not in medicine alone; it is a malaise of our whole society, and one has to acknowledge this. But in medicine of course it is more distinctly manifest, because what is involved is not the production of a machine-tool or a television, but the health and life of a human being. Of course, we have to begin treatment with medicine where mercy, responsibility, and professional competence have to triumph. But society also has to place the health care of people at the forefront of its plans and activity. Is it really possible to come to terms with the fact that there are not enough medicines which, to a sick person mean more than bread? And I would like to appeal to Gosplan comrades: Just ask anyone what is more important to buy abroad—labels for the Gosagroprom industry, polythene bags, cigarette filters, perfumes, or medicines to save sick people. [applause] I think that if (?ever) you were to meet with these sufferers as we do, you would have no doubts.

One of the mandates which I received on my election as a delegate consisted of the demand that I give a report here that enterprises and labor collectives should bear not only moral, but also material responsibility for workers' health. So let us proclaim: Everything for the human being, everything for his well-being. [end recording]

Then Comrade Masaliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, came up to the rostrum. The speaker devoted particular attention to the role of the party at the present stage in the development of our society. He stressed that the most reliable guarantee for its democratization is the implementation of the tasks outlined in the report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and the preservation of the atmosphere in which the discussion of the theses for the 19th all-union party conference took place.

After the speech by Comrade Masaliyev, the delegates to the party forum were addressed by Comrade Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who chaired the evening session. Closing the evening session of the conference, he proposed, on the basis of the agenda, that two resolutions be formulated: On Progress in the Implementation of the Decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks To Deepen Restructuring and the second, On Measures for the Democratization and Reform of the Political System. It was proposed that the single commission deal with these resolutions. It was also proposed that a few separate resolutions be accepted—On the Struggle Against Bureaucracy, On Openness, On International [Mezhnatsionalnyye Otnosheniya] Relations, and On Legal Reform—and that special commissions be set up to draft these resolutions, to prepare their membership, and to present them for consideration by the conference tomorrow.

With this, the first day of the work of the 19th All-Union Party Conference came to an end.

Further on Chazov Address

PM3006141788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p4

[Speech by Ye.I. Chazov, USSR minister of health, at 28 June afternoon session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! Our conference will be discussing ways to restructure our society and the priorities in its development. Perhaps, considering that Mikhail Sergeyevich has already said in his report that priority in the 13th 5-year plan will be given to the social sphere, there is no point in my saying this, too. But in view of the fact that public health has not been given the floor for a long time in our country, I would like to express a few words and thoughts today. I would like to start by saying that in the period of preparation for the party conference, I heard a great deal of concern expressed in speeches regarding the fate of restructuring and glasnost, with people saying that there are forces and mechanisms

holding back this process. But I believe, comrades, that the course of our conference and the opinion of all Soviet people show that we can no longer live in the old way and that the only way out of the serious situation in which the country has found itself, the only way to make it a prosperous socialist state in reality and not just in slogans, is to renew our society, the economy, and the social sphere.

Allow me to remind you that for a long time, we have proclaimed: "Everything for man; everything for his wellbeing." But until the 27th party congress, this priority was just another slogan not backed up by real action. I would like to refer back to the past because we must never repeat its mistakes. We were proud of our public health care system. But we kept quiet about the fact that we were 50th in the world, below Mauritius and Barbados, in terms of the infant mortality level. We were proud that our country has more doctors and hospitals than any other country in the world, but we kept quiet about the fact that in terms of average life expectancy, we are 32d in the world. The Uzbek writer Sh. Rashidov wrote of happy children in a flourishing republic, but the leader of the Uzbek Communist Party Sh. Rashidov did absolutely nothing to save the 33,000 children who died every year under the age of 1 year. Billions of rubles were squandered and embezzled in the republic while 46 percent of its hospitals were located in buildings that did not meet the minimum requirements of sanitation and hygiene. And, for comparison: Now, when the wind of renewal has reached Uzbekistan, we will be able to provide 10,000 beds, primarily for children, in the 400 buildings erected by party and government organizations and given to the health service.

Another example: the construction project of the age, the Baikal-Amur Main Railroad. In Tynda, they built a railroad station of marble and aluminum. Well, how could it be otherwise?! The country's prestige was at stake. The fact that the rayon hospital in this same city is housed in a barracks-like building without any conveniences, well, what of it, comrades? The delegations will not be going there anyway. They have the Baikal-Amur railroad and all Siberia to see.

In Moscow a hospital for Patriotic War invalids took 11 years to build. I can give you many such examples. Think how many high-flown words were said about Kazakhstan where, according to its leaders at the 26th party congress, "a spirit of amazing achievement, and the happiness and joy of impetuous creativity" prevailed. But, comrades, how could these words be accepted by the 60,000 inhabitants of the republic with tuberculosis—a disease we were in such a hurry to say we had eliminated in our country? They had seen a public bath and health center built in marble in the center of Alma-Ata at a cost of R15 million. Perhaps this public bath was necessary; perhaps this center was needed. But you should see the conditions in which patients with tuberculosis are treated in the tuberculosis institute close by.

And this picture of the attitude to the innermost needs of human beings—of which health is one—was not only true of these regions. It is sometimes said that this bitter truth has only been brought to light now and that the leadership was unaware of the situation. This is not true. Scientists, doctors, and party workers informed them of the situation. They sometimes even achieved positive decisions. But then everything subsided and collapsed when faced with reactions like this: Yes, you have stated the issue correctly, but today there are other, higher state interests, and you must wait. So they waited. The result is the very serious situation in public health care we have inherited today and which will take more than one 5-year plan to put right.

Nowadays the word "glasnost" is very often heard in speeches, in the press, and on radio and television. But this is frequently interpreted simply as freedom of speech, which is guaranteed by our Constitution. Are we not devaluing this concept that is new to us? Will we not be repeating the mistakes of the past, when words result in actions being forgotten?

Comrades, glasnost today is a real lever for exposing the causes of the braking mechanisms and developing ways to renew our country on this basis.

I would like to say that one specific example of these realities is the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on improving public health care for the Soviet people, which was published last week. It must be frankly said that the road leading to this resolution was not easy. Attempts were made, as in the past, to submerge the heart of the problem in general discussions and appeals not backed up by constructive decisions. Only the firm policy of the Politburo, which is really aware of the shortfalls in the public health sphere, made it possible to work out and adopt a constructive plan, underpinned by material resources, to improve public health care.

In order to appreciate the scale of the restructuring work that lies ahead, it is sufficient to point out that allocations for running costs in the next 5-year plan are going to be doubled and the total capital investment of R9 billion in this 5-year plan is to be increased to R25 billion in the next one. Is this a lot or not enough?

When, in view of the serious situation of the public health sector, the Politburo found an additional R5.4 billion last year for this sector despite our country's financial difficulties, our colleagues and doctors in the United States calculated that this was equivalent to the cost of 3 cruisers or 125 antisubmarine aircraft.

That is why we doctors fervently support the disarmament that has now begun; we are in favor of disarmament and hope that in the near future, public health will receive extra funds not equivalent to the cost of three cruisers perhaps, but at least several aircraft carriers or hundreds of missiles.

When we talk about constructive decisions we must, of course, proceed from the economy's real potential. Academician Abalkin described the complex economic situation in his speech. It must be said that from this standpoint, the approved resolution is naturally the optimum one. The foreign press is very closely following the processes taking place in our country, including in the public health sphere, comrades. What is more, it tries to get to the heart of global changes—which, unfortunately, our own press often does not do enough of when writing on the problems of public health care. The newspaper the LOS ANGELES TIMES, which could not be accused of any affection for our society, wrote on 15 May this year: "After long years of stagnation, the Soviet authorities have once again begun to give preference to health care.... These reforms (namely in health care) are an integral part of the restructuring policy being conducted by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. While many governments are looking for ways to cut down on public health costs, the Soviet Union plans to triple the annual health budget by the year 2000...."

It is very interesting that this newspaper also remarks on another important fact we sometimes forget—that the responsibility for Soviet people's health care is carried by society as a whole.

I would like to say a few words from the standpoint of the role played by society in public health care about efforts to intensify activity by soviets at all levels in backing up this very important work. Unfortunately, soviets and their executive committees do not everywhere or always fulfill their role in one of their main functions: public health care.

Local soviets often forget that city, oblast, and kray health departments are not Ministry of Health bodies but an integral part of the relevant executive committees. Of course, the system of centralized financing, planning, and administration that has evolved over the years is also to blame here. This system is now an anachronism holding back the solution of social problems, although it does perhaps suit some financing and planning bodies. I would like to point out that, unfortunately, we have not devoted a great deal of attention to the economic structure of the social spheres, nor are we today.

Take public health care, for example. This is not simply a humane obligation of our society but a very important sphere of our country's economy. We still pay little attention to our profits and losses in the health sphere.

It is well known, for example, that the economic losses resulting from 1 day of incapacity for work amount to an average of R26. Using simple arithmetic, multiply this figure by the 4 million who every day do not go to work because of sickness or the need to care for someone else who is sick, and you will have a colossal figure—R100 million in 1 day alone.

On the other hand, the economic benefit from extending people's working life amounts to R4,700 per worker per annum. So you can reckon the total economic benefit runs into tens of billions of rubles.

The present system of financing and planning, which is based on extensive quantitative indicators reflecting nothing at all—the number of beds in use, the number of visits to clinics—does not help to improve the quality of medical services because it is not geared to the end result—preserving people's health.

Ask anyone sitting here in the audience: How much does the state spend on the protection of his health? I am sure that no one will be able to answer. At the same time, calculations show that in 1985 the figure for the Latvian SSR was R70 per person; the Estonian SSR, R68.9; Tajikistan, R41.8; Kirghizia, R44.3; and Moldavia, R54.4.

Let us remember, comrades, that Lenin's social insurance and hospital funding plan implemented until 1933 guaranteed glasnost in the process of determining funds used for health care, workers' participation in determining these funds, and their distribution through special worker conferences. If we had kept to these principles, we would probably not have reached the stage where we are somewhere in the middle seventies out of 126 countries in terms of the level of payments from the gross national product for public health care. If we really want to solve our health care problems, we must urgently adopt new criteria and normatives for the financing and planning of public health care. We cannot reconcile ourselves to the fact that year after year, the health service has not even had an adequate wage fund—and still does not now. The basic criteria must strictly establish the percentage of the gross national product to be spent on health care and calculate all financial indicators per person with a coefficient allowing adjustments for regional differences.

First of all, this will make the size of health funds strictly dependent on the results of work in our society. This will also remove a number of questions raised by Academician Abalkin about how local bodies can attract resources to solve their problems.

We do appreciate that solving only the financial, material, and technical problems will not radically change the situation which has taken shape in the care of Soviet people's health. We have to look for new systems of organization and administration. We have to eradicate stagnation, bureaucracy, irresponsibility, and heartlessness among medical workers. Unfortunately, this is not only a disease of the medical profession but of our entire society. We must admit this. But in medicine it is, of course, more clearly apparent because it is a question of people's lives and health rather than the production of a machine tool or television set. We must, of course, begin the healing process in the medical sphere, where charity,

responsibility, and professional competence must prevail. But society, too, must give paramount importance to public health care in its plans and activity. Can we really accept that there is a shortage of medicine, which means more to a patient than bread?! I would like to appeal to our comrades in Gosplan: Ask anyone what is more important to buy abroad: labels for the Gosagroprom industry, polythene bags, cigarette filters, perfume, or medicines to save people who are sick? (applause)

I think that if you met these sufferers even once, as we do, you would have no doubts.

We really cannot reconcile ourselves to the shortage of medical equipment. The USSR Council of Ministers has now passed a very good resolution on the development and manufacture of this equipment. But, unfortunately, it will not appear until 1993-1995, although we are short of even the simplest equipment for commissioning medical projects: approximately 1,000 operating tables, 5,000 surgical lamps, and 100,000 bactericidal lamps.

After all, comrades, this is for people, for their health. The people's health is society's greatest asset. And how are we protecting this asset? As a result of poor water supplies, the low level of sanitation and hygiene at many dairy and meat processing enterprises, and the low level of sanitation generally, 1.7 million people suffer serious intestinal disorders every year in our country. And the problems of the environment, hygiene at work, the sanitary condition of cities and reservoirs, alcoholism, drug addiction—these all affect people's health!

Are we, public health bodies included, not too liberal in our attitude to those who treat this asset of society carelessly? One of the instructions I was given on my election as a delegate was the demand that I tell the conference that enterprises and labor collectives should bear material as well as moral responsibility for the health of their workers. If we want a healthy society, we must urgently solve these problems.

Karl Marx once wrote: "What is sickness, if not life constrained in its freedom?" We cannot be entirely happy and free if we do not have our health. We now talk of unity as the foundation of our success in the future. So let us proclaim in our deeds rather than words: "Everything for man; everything for his wellbeing." We will unite in determining social problems as the main priority in the activity of our party and all society. This unity will be understood and supported by all our people. Thank you. (applause)

Masaliyev Criticizes Press

PM3006102188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

["Speech by Comrade A.M. Masaliyev (First Secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee)" at the 28 June afternoon session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report outlined in detail the most important problems of our further sociopolitical and state development. The discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses in party organizations and labor collectives in our republic and throughout the country generated tremendous enthusiasm because the fate of our socialist fatherland is being decided. Serious negative processes and gross violations in our life are being discussed. In this context, I would like to dwell on some questions on the agenda.

First of all, about the party's role in our society's life. I cannot argue with Comrade Abalkin—there is no time for that. As soon as he started speaking, he asked: Is it possible to ensure democracy under a one-party system, the way soviets functions now? Yes or no? It seems to me, and this is my personal opinion, that practice shows that if we implement the ideas and tasks outlined in Comrade Gorbachev's report, if we map out measures preventing the concentration of party and state power in just one man's hands, if we introduce changes into the activity of our soviets, then we will, I think, ensure it. (Applause) But for this purpose, comrades, it is certain that the atmosphere and conditions which have prevailed now, before the conference, must be maintained, the active work must continue, and our party must create opportunities in this regard. This is the main task. And in this context I agree with the proposals for utmost democratization and improvement of the CPSU's vital work. At the same time, it is impossible to give categorical support to those who propose: If you want to, join the party; if you don't like it, resign from it and there will no further consequences. What is this—a pleasure garden? The party, comrades, is neither a cooperative society nor an informal association. (Applause) According to the Statute, it is the supreme form of sociopolitical organization, the nucleus of the political system, the leading and guiding force of Soviet society. The immutable law of the CPSU's life is: ideological and organizational unity, monolithic ranks, high and conscientious discipline by all Communists. It is widely known, and I would remind you once more, of Lenin's words on protecting the party's purity and prestige back at the Second Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party Congress: "It is better for 10 workers not to call themselves party members (genuine workers do not chase titles!) than for one chatterbox to be given the right and opportunity to become a party member." (Applause)

We agree with proposals about the party's periodic self-cleansing. But, comrades, we cannot allow party members to leave our ranks when they become pensioners, as some people propose. This will cause great moral damage and will undermine continuity between generations. I think that such an attitude to our respected veterans would be altogether inhuman. (Applause)

There is no doubt that the forms and methods of party work must be changed in today's conditions. In parallel with other measures, there must be clearly defined timetables for holding party committee plenums. It would expedient for union republic Communist Party

Central Committee plenums and for party obkom and kraykom plenums to be held once every 6 months; and for party raykom, gorkom, and okruzhkom plenums to be held once every 4 months.

We all know well that a lot of time is consumed on plenum preparations, leaving simply no time for lively organizational work with people. This change would also ease the situation in primary organizations, which now have to discuss a vast quantity of decisions by higher-ranking party committees. Thought must also be given to changes in the form in which plenums are held, so as to ensure that their decisions are specific and have a real effect on improvements in work.

Everything possible must be done to boost the primary party organization's prestige, to clearly define the status of its secretary, and to reduce his dependence, including material dependence, on economic leaders.

The rights and duties of elected party organs and their members need to be defined more fully and specifically in the CPSU Statutes.

The next question concerns cadres. Limiting party committee secretaries to two terms of office will certainly make it more difficult for cults and abuses of power to emerge. But it must also be laid down, comrades—and many Communists and party organizations in our republic feel this—that people over the age of 65 should not be appointed general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee or chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, which are the most difficult sectors in our activity. (Applause) What I mean, comrades, and you have obviously understood me correctly, is that people over 65 should not be renominated. This requirement should extend to top leaders of union republics and to USSR ministers and state committee chairmen. We must elaborate mechanisms to prevent incompetent people from taking up leadership office, especially in the central apparatus of party and state organs.

In order to resolve any questions that might arise, it ought to be adopted as a rule that top leaders of all ranks should annually report back to collectives and elected organs about their personal activity.

Recently the mass media have widely criticized the prevailing system of work with cadres. It is suggested in particular that the party committees' nomenklatura be abolished and its functions transferred to soviets and other organs. It is, of course, necessary to change attitudes here and bring cadre work in line with the demands of society's democratization. But cadre work must not be allowed to just drift along.

Our party exercises its leading role primarily through cadres. Touching on this problem, V.I. Lenin said at the 11th Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress: "If the Central Committee were deprived of its right to deal with the placement of people, it would be incapable of directing policy."

It follows from this that, in conditions of broadest possible democracy in the selection, assessment, and placement of cadres, the party must retain the decisive role in this work. There is no contradiction here, comrades, since party organs must rely on the opinion of working people and primary organizations in the solution of cadre questions.

Here is another important question. As a party worker, I have been worried for a long time by the unsatisfactory state of party and state discipline. It is well known that the management organs' apparatus wastes the lion's share of its time on holding all sorts of sessions and conferences. And their skilled workers are busy compiling numerous decisions. Let us be frank: The majority of these decisions are poorly executed. Matters are improving only slowly. Before implementing one decision, we get down to adopting new ones, and this swells instead of reducing the flow of paperwork. If we want to properly restructure ourselves, we must effectively strengthen executive discipline and achieve full implementation of adopted decisions. Comrades, Vladimir Ilich Lenin himself especially emphasized in the past that control and execution constitute a crucial question of party and soviet work. For this purpose it is necessary to ensure that decisions are concise, realistic, and addressed to persons who are specifically responsible for their fulfillment. The adoption of major long-term decisions must be reduced to a minimum. This is because they tend to be poorly fulfilled, become outdated, and life necessitates amendments. The fulfillment of resolutions must be monitored by the organ adopting them, without passing this function to other monitoring organs. In other words, every organ, including the CPSU Central Committee, and each one of its specific officials must bear specific responsibility for the fate of the document that has been produced. It must become the rule that, as soon as the set time limit has run out, there must be a mandatory summing up of the decision's fulfillment with participation by its authors and executants, producing an assessment and drawing conclusions. Party congress decisions must be subject to particular monitoring. It seems to me that by no means everything has been thought out here.

Here is an example. The 26th CPSU Congress documents laid down that research and prospecting work was to be done in 1981-1985 on the comprehensive utilization of mineral raw material, land, water, and energy resources in Issyk-Kul Oblast and the Chuya Valley region. The 27th party congress decisions provided as follows: "Work is to be started on the comprehensive utilization of the Sary-Jaz River's water and energy resources." Time is passing, while scientific, planning, and economic organs continue debating the expediency of carrying out this work. And the appropriate CPSU Central Committee departments and the government have not once asked about progress in the fulfillment of the congress decisions, and even the republic is not demonstrating the proper activeness in this regard.

A few words about the work of the press. Mikhail Sergeyevich's report rightly said that it is waging an active struggle against negative phenomena and instances of bureaucratism and irresponsibility. At the same time, comrades—and I want to mention this in particular—there are quite a few journalists who display incompetence in the coverage of problems, frequently distort events, and juggle with facts in their pursuit of sensationalism. Unobjective and unverified materials have started appearing in central and republic newspapers and journals. (Applause)

It has come to the point where one or two press workers start assessing an entire elected party organ. (Applause) Annoying inaccuracies and mistakes occur in the coverage of the delicate and acute question of interethnic relations, and this has a negative effect on people's international education and the strengthening of friendship among our peoples.

As a rule, journalists and some newspapers do not admit their mistakes and take no responsibility for them. They see themselves as the main executants of restructuring, trying to ignore party organs and to set the public in opposition to them. (Applause) We cannot consider the situation normal if the press is mainly reporting negative facts. I would like to say, comrades, that this applies in particular to the Central Asian republics. As a matter of fact, on many occasions these republics are spoken of in the same breath by some of the country's leading figures. I think that such important questions must be approached fastidiously.

Comrades, the present all-union party conference is going to be tremendously instructive for us all. We delegates from the Kirghiz Republic party organization will take the conference's businesslike spirit and decisions to our Communist comrades and all citizens and, together with them, will actively get down to their implementation.

Thank you. (Applause)

Yakovlev News Briefing Reported

PM3006130588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "At 19th All-Union CPSU Conference Press Center"]

[Excerpts] A news conference devoted to the opening and 1st day of work of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference and the report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was held at the party conference press center on 28 June. Soviet and foreign journalists were addressed by A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He said: [passage omitted]

The report raises the question of the legal socialist state, that is, a state in which the supremacy of the law and the equality before the law of all without exception are paramount. That is, the safeguarding of man's individual rights across the broadest range—social, spiritual, political, and moral. The real, full power of the Soviets from the top down. The real rather than purely verbal inclusion in management of tens of millions of people, and scope for the processes of self-management and self-regulation.

M.S. Gorbachev raised the question of the new role of the party as the political vanguard of society. Under present-day conditions there must be a fundamental restructuring of all its activity, style, means, forms, and methods of work from the primary organization through to the CPSU Central Committee. The party at all levels really must do what it is supposed to do—that is, determine and implement a political strategy and do this via Communists in soviets, state organs, and labor collectives. Everyone will do his work and will be responsible for it.

It is necessary to fully revive the internal party democracy which was particularly distorted during the years of the personality cult and stagnation.

Restructuring began on the party's initiative. The CPSU consicously and intentionally submitted itself to social criticism here. Only thus can it open all the doors to a really profound and constant analysis of the present state of Soviet society, view itself in the mirror of unprejudiced public opinion, analyze the processes within the party itself, and unite the broad people's masses around its ideas. [passage omitted]

A.N. Yakovlev answered numerous questions from journalists.

Second Day Conference Proceedings Reported

29 Jun Speakers Listed

LD2906171388 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—The 19th National Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) continued for the second day in the Kremlin today.

The morning session was chaired by Lev Zaykov, a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee who is first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee.

The delegates heard a report by the mandate commission, delivered by its Chairman Georgiy Razumovskiy, an alternate member of the Politburo and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and endorsed it unanimously.

Then they carried on the debate on Mikhail Gorbachev's report reviewing the progress of realization of the decisions of the 27th party congress and the tasks of furthering the perestroika (restructuring) effort.

The speakers included V.I. Kalashnikov, first secretary of the Volgograd region committee of the CPSU; V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the board of Writers of the USSR; F.V. Popov, first secretary of the Altay territory committee of the CPSU; V.P. Smirnov, a radio equipment adjuster at the Leningrad-based V.I. Lenin Optico-Mechanical Factory; G.A. Arbatov, director of the Institute of U.S. and Canada Studies under the Soviet Academy of Sciences; and A.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan.

The conference elected commissions to draft resolutions:

—On the progress of realization of the decisions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the tasks of furthering perestroika and on democratization in Soviet society and a reform of the political system,

—On combatting red tape,

—On interethnic relations,

—On glasnost (openness),

—On legal reform.

The debate on the report resumed after a break under the chairmanship of Nikolay Slyunkov, a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The speakers included M.A. Ulyanov, chairman of the board of Theatrical Workers of the Russian Federation; B.V. Kachura, a secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine; S.A. Fedotova, a school teacher from the city of Perm; and G.I. Marchuk, president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

The discussion was continued at the afternoon session chaired by Vadim Nikonov, a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The speakers included S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia; Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia; Yu.V. Bondarev, a deputy chairman of the board of Writers of the Russian Federation; I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Krasnodar Territory Committee of the CPSU; V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League; V.P. Kabaidze, director-general of the Ivanovo Machine-Tool Factory named after the 50th anniversary of the USSR; and B.K. Pugo, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia.

The speeches were followed with close attention and sometimes punctuated by comments, lively remarks and polemical observations.

At the end of the sitting Gorbachev answered several questions which were put before the presidium of the conference.

Razumovskiy Credentials Report

PM3006114188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition pp 4-5

[Credentials Commission Report to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, delivered by G.P. Razumovskiy, chairman of the Credentials Commission, candidate member of the Politburo, and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 29 June morning session]

[Text] Comrades!

The 19th All-union Party Conference is being held at a time of historic breakthrough, a time of profound revolutionary transformations in our country. It is examining questions of fundamental significance to our party, society's progress, and the fate of socialism.

The CPSU Central Committee report delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, summed up the results of the work done to fulfill the 27th party congress decisions and to deepen the restructuring process. They convincingly show that the course taken by our party since April 1985 aimed at accelerating socioeconomic development and achieving a qualitatively new state of Soviet society is being steadily and consistently implemented. The process of renewal embraces all spheres of life. At the same time, restructuring is not proceeding smoothly or without obstacles, and it frequently encounters difficulties of an objective and subjective character. The report spoke with full frankness about this.

The sober scientific analysis of the entire complex of political, socioeconomic, and ideological problems facing us, the critical interpretation of the experience gained in past years, and the constructive thrust of the report and the action program contained in it permit the creative and collective elaboration of answers to the questions—which concern everyone—of how we are to work in the future to give restructuring a powerful new impetus and make it irreversible. All this inspires the confidence that the all-union party conference will be a decisive step on the path of restoring and developing the Leninist traditions of internal party democracy, asserting socialist people's power, and revealing the humanist nature and creative power of socialism.

During the preparation for the conference the democratic processes taking place in the life and activity of our party under the influence of the decisions of the 27th

CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums were given direct expression, and this has been manifested in the approaches to the election of delegates.

In accordance with the CPSU Statutes, the Central Committee June (1987) Plenum established that conference delegates are to be elected by secret ballot at plenums of union republic Communist Party central committees and party kraykoms and obkoms. Acting in the spirit of democratization, the CPSU Central Committee steered the local party organs toward the election to the party forum of active supporters of restructuring, and toward broad consultation with Communists and all the working people about conference delegate candidacies. In the majority of cases the nomination of candidates began with primary party organizations and was implemented in the light of the opinions of labor collectives and the public. As a rule it took place in an atmosphere of glasnost, free discussion, and competition. Usually the number of candidates considerably exceeded the required number of delegates. Openness and democracy as a whole were characteristic of the party committee plenums which elected delegates.

The new approach to the election of conference delegates has elicited a great response in the party and among the people, and a further growth in political activeness. The keen and principled way in which each proposed candidacy was discussed indicates the increased interest of Communists and nonparty people in the party's affairs and the conference's success.

For party organs and party cadres the election of delegates was a good schooling and a serious test of their ability to work in conditions of a developing democracy. However, not everyone everywhere was ready for a detailed discussion with people which excluded unnecessary haste. Sometimes public opinion was not given due consideration, as happened, for example, in the Astrakhan, Sakhalin, and Yaroslavl Oblast party organizations. The problems which arose were ultimately resolved by democratic means.

Comrades! The Credentials Commission reports to the conference that the elections of delegates in all party organizations were conducted in accordance with the established procedure and the norms of representation stipulated by the Central Committee: 1 delegate to 3,780 party members. Five thousand delegates have been elected to the conference.

The Credentials Commission has examined all the delegates' credentials [polnomochiya] and deemed them valid.

Party organizations from krays and oblasts in the RSFSR have elected 2,933 conference delegates. The delegations of republic party organizations are as follows: Ukraine—891 people, Belorussia—191, Uzbekistan—178, Kazakhstan—225, Georgia—106, Azerbaijan—104, Lithuania—56, Moldavia—52, Latvia—53, Kirghizia—40, Tajikistan—33, Armenia—51, Turkmenistan—31, Estonia—32.

Large delegations represent the following party organization: Moscow—319 people, Leningrad Oblast—176, Moscow Oblast—155, Donetsk Oblast—93, Krasnodar Kray—89, Rostov Oblast—88, Sverdlovsk Oblast—75, Dnepropetrovsk Oblast—73, and Gorkiy Oblast—71.

Comrades! The composition of the delegations reflects the whole range of our society—the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, the Soviet intelligentsia, women, young people, and party and labor veterans. In the different sectors of social production, science, culture, health care, the public education sphere, and management organs where they work they promote restructuring by means of their creative labor and their high social activeness.

The most widely represented at the conference are workers. There are 1,638 of them among the delegates, or almost one-third of the total. This accords with the place of workers in our party and the decisive role of the working class in implementing restructuring and the practical tasks of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development.

Worker delegates set examples of high labor productivity and quality and are active supporters of the introduction of progressive methods of economic management and the assertion of the principles of socialist self-management in production. It is noteworthy that over 700 of them are members of labor collective councils and 149 are council chairmen.

Some 866 agricultural workers have been elected to the conference. These truly are the best people from our countryside who, by personal example and concrete practical deeds, assert the party's chosen course of revealing the potential of kolkhozes and sovkhozes by applying the new forms of economic management, the collective, lease, and family contract, and the creation and development of various forms of cooperative associations.

Under conditions of the economic reform, when enterprises' independence is being considerably expanded and their transfer to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing is being carried out, very much depends on our economic cadres at the head of labor collectives and on their sense of innovation, professionalism, and initiative. Some 354 leaders of production associations, combines, firms, intersectoral scientific and technical complexes, design organizations, and technical services, 108 kolkhoz chairmen, and 74 sovkhoz directors have been elected conference delegates.

The scientific and creative intelligentsia is making a great contribution to social transformations, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the molding of socialist consciousness, the artistic portrayal of reality, and the enhancement of the people's culture and level of education. The intelligentsia is represented by 436 delegates. They include 175 science and VUZ workers, 94 education workers, 41 health care workers, and 69 workers from the world of culture and art. Of these, 112 are full or corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences, sectoral academies, and union republic academies of sciences.

Our press and all the mass media have an extremely great role to play in developing the process of democratization, ensuring broad glasnost, and determining and shaping public opinion. People assess the true merit of this. Forty-three press workers have been elected conference delegates.

Restructuring has sharply raised the level of demands on party cadres and their responsibility for implementing the party's course. It is particularly important for them now to master political methods of leadership, to know how to act in conditions of democracy, and to work constantly in the midst of the people. In the last few years party cadres have been considerably renewed and replenished with fresh forces and with resourceful and energetic people. Among the conference delegates there are 290 secretaries of union republic Communist Party central committees and party kraykoms and obkoms and 537 secretaries of party okrug committees, gorkoms, and raykoms. The elective party aktiv is widely represented—3,153 delegates, or 63 percent of the total, are members of elective party organs at various levels, and 762 are secretaries of primary and shop party organizations and party group organizers.

Ensuring the real full power of the soviets and restoring in full measure their role and authority is both an indispensable condition of resolving the fundamental tasks of socialist creation and the main direction of the democratization of society. There are 3,119 conference delegates who are deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, union and autonomous republic supreme soviets, and local soviets. The development of self-management principles is linked with the increased activeness of all social organizations belonging to our political system. Some 629 soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organ officials have been elected conference delegates.

Representatives of our Armed Forces are participating in the conference's work. Army Communists are making their contribution to ensuring the country's effective defense capability and its qualitative improvement.

Soviet women are participating most actively in all the work of renewing our socialist society. There are 1,258 women delegates to the conference, or over 25 percent of the total.

Our Leninist party and Communists have always been a unifying international force and the soul of the great socialist union of all the peoples of our country. Representatives of 72 nations and nationalities are attending the conference.

Different generations of Communists have been elected to the conference: 29.1 percent of delegates are aged up to 40, 36.0 percent are aged from 41 to 50, 27.2 percent are from 51 to 60, and 7.7 percent are over 60.

The breakdown of length of party membership is as follows. There are 47 people who joined the party between 1919 and 1940, 143 who joined the party between 1941 and 1945, that is, during the Great Patriotic War, and 1,948 who joined from 1946 through 1965. More than one-half of the delegates—2,862 people—joined the party between 1966 and 1988.

More than 97 percent of delegates have higher, incomplete higher, and secondary education.

Almost 86 percent of delegates have been awarded orders and medals for combat and labor services, 33 people have been awarded the title Hero of the Soviet Union, and 276 that of Hero of Socialist Labor. There are 317 delegates who are winners of Lenin or State Prizes.

Comrades! The composition of the delegations and the work of the conference convincingly demonstrate that our party, which has a Leninist sense of its responsibility to the people, is full of creative forces. It is steadfastly pursuing the course of the Central Committee April (1985) plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress and is the moving force behind the revolutionary renewal of our socialist society. The holding of the 19th all-union party conference and the decisions which it is going to take will undoubtedly help to intensify the party's influence on the course of restructuring and to enhance the role of the CPSU as the militant political vanguard of the Soviet people. (Applause)

Kalashnikov Criticizes Progress

PM3006101188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[Speech by V.I. Kalashnikov, first secretary of Volgograd CPSU Obkom, at 29 June morning session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades! Yesterday PRAVDA published the instructions to delegates from the people of Volgograd: "Comrade Delegates, the party and the people have shown tremendous trust in you, but do not forget that you bear an equally tremendous responsibility. To the time and the country, to our children's future. Give no ground to the braking forces and all the mourners for the old days. Do not stop at half-measures, otherwise the

daily welter of familiar ways will sweep us all back into the old morass. Therefore we must only go forward, since there is no other way...." (Applause)

That is the position of our delegation, which approves the conclusions and proposals set out in Comrade Gorbachev's report since they reflect the people's interests and aspirations, will be a reliable guarantee of the irreversibility of restructuring and the renewal of socialism, and prompt serious reflection.

A considerable amount has been done in the last 3 years. The state of affairs in our oblast also confirms this. A breakthrough has emerged in cadre policy, the resolution of economic and social problems, and the development of democracy and glasnost. People are seeing for themselves the real turn toward man as the supreme goal and determining factor of restructuring. And this is helping to improve their mood and to produce a healthier moral and psychological atmosphere in labor collectives.

At the same time new problems have arisen and many questions are by no means being resolved as simply as had been supposed. Assessing the situation objectively, it should be said that the braking mechanism is still very strong. Many people are equivocal about the present situation and are worried about the fact that the situation is changing slowly and stagnation persists in some areas. And we believe that one of the main reasons for this is inconsistency and contradictoriness in implementing the program outlined by the 27th party congress. The gap between word and deed in the economy and ideology continues.

During the discussion of the Theses the oblast's working people showed great interest in the historical past of our party and country. They spoke of the extremely crude violations of the personality cult period and the time of stagnation. And many asked us: What guarantee is there against throwbacks to the grim past? The guarantee of the renewal of socialism, the guarantee against errors, is democracy and glasnost, above all within the party itself. The party is the initiator of restructuring and must set an example in developing democracy and political methods of leadership. The members of the party Central Committee bear a special responsibility at this crucial historical period. This is why Central Committee members and party obkom secretaries must be better informed and convinced by genuine documents on questions such as the rehabilitation of party and state figures and in the assessments of historical events, and must see the transcripts of statesmen's talks. Today we are learning what happened 70 years ago. We cannot allow our grandchildren to wait until 2050 to learn what is happening today. (Applause)

We cannot be satisfied with the contradictory and sometimes unobjective information in newspapers and journals. I also believe it is expedient for Central Committee members to take part in preparing major issues at Central Committee plenums and in the Politburo. We greatly value the good example of collegiality set by the consultations of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with Central Committee members and obkom secretaries during the preparation of the Theses for the present party conference. Only broad information, discussion, and consultation on major questions will provide a guarantee against errors for which we later pay a high price.

We are also worried by the serious difficulties along the road of implementing the economic reform. The main brake now does not lie in labor collectives. The Law on the State Enterprise is not operating. Enterprises do not have total independence because the rear services of production sectors—planning, supply, credit and financial support, price formation, in other words, economic levers, the things that central organs and economic science were supposed to decide—instead of leading the way, are lagging behind in the elaboration of these questions, lagging behind in their renewal. And they are objectively a brake on the introduction of the economic reform.

What is needed is not only talk of difficulties and shortcomings, such as was heard in Comrade Abalkin's speech, but positive changes and a persistent and vigorous stance. But many people are still saying that everything is bad, are almost rejoicing at this, and are doing little to change the situation for the better. (Applause)

The economic reform is also paralyzed to a considerable extent by the bureaucratic position of a number of ministries. We must realize that until ministries' duties regarding their enterprises are clearly defined, their remuneration will not be made dependent on profits, the introduction of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, output quality, and the other fundamental indicators and the new economic mechanism will not come into operation. But a mechanical reduction in the size of the ministries' apparatus without any change in their functions will scarcely change anything and will preserve diktat, petty tutelage, and bureaucratic leadership methods.

Now a few words about the revival of the countryside.

At the last session Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov very correctly said that for a long time the country solved many problems at agriculture's expense. For it is an open secret that even today agricultural production is in an unequal position compared with other sectors of the economy.

But there is also something else I want to say, namely: The kolkhoz member himself still does not enjoy equal rights with the worker in many respects. If circumstances force a kolkhoz member to go to work in an industrial enterprise, his length of service on the kolkhoz does not count toward his pension. Kolkhoz members' minimum pension is also lower.

We have inherited these remnants of serfdom from the period of stagnation. It is time to restore social justice with respect to kolkhoz members. (Applause) In our opinion, the present approach is not only mistaken but immoral.

The countryside's development is now being held back, or, to be more accurate, was being held back, by a plethora of prohibitions. It is only now, with the adoption of the Law on the Cooperative System and the development of the collective contract, that the creative forces of rural working people are being released. Similar difficulties to those in industry lie in store for us along this path. Even during the preparation of the Law on the Cooperative System, in the USSR Supreme Soviet commissions the independence of kolkhozes and sovkhozes in planning and their right to dispose of the resources they themselves have earned had to be defended. Defended from the Gosagroprom and the Ministry of Finance. A similar attitude also exists at the republican, oblast, and rayon levels, where there is still distrust of rural working people and cadres and a desire to retain the approach of issuing commands from above.

We still have much work to do to instill in rural working people a sense of being their own masters and develop their independence and initiative.

Comrades! Volgograd Oblast's Communists and working people put forward 48,000 proposals during the discussion of the Theses. The debate in party organizations and the press showed that questions of improving the political system and developing democracy perturb society just as much as economic problems.

It is no accident that we have returned over and over again to the documents of the 10th Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) Congress and the 10th all-Russian party conference and to Vladimir Ilich Lenin's last letters and articles, which are rightly called a political testament and plan for building socialism. We are seeing for ourselves that today we must more often consult Lenin, for in his living thought, his ideas on cooperatives, and his plan for building socialism we find convincing answers to many questions that have confronted us in the process of restructuring, including those relating to improving the political system.

Taking into account the exceptional responsibility of the upcoming decision, today it is important, as Vladimir Ilich Lenin said, not to reduce political reform to bustle, to the creation of new commissions, committees, and institutions, and not to forget Lenin's warning: "Any half-hearted decision here would be extremely harmful."

Lenin's political testament traces the idea of uniting party institutions with soviet institutions. The question of enhancing the role of the soviets is particularly acute today. Seven resolutions have been adopted on the soviets recently, but they have not achieved their objective, the reason being that questions of the soviets' economic base have not been resolved. The soviets are not masters on their own territory. Therefore the party's leading role in the soviets is equally important nowadays.

In switching to political methods of leadership, we should give proper thought to the party's real role in society's political system. On the one hand, we must not supplant soviet executive and economic organs. That is, we must demarcate functions. And on the other hand, in order to increase the authority of the soviets, in our view, party leadership should be combined with [leadership of] soviet representative organs at all levels—rayons, cities, oblasts, republics, and the country.

This is especially necessary now. This is a transitional period when restructuring is really only beginning to develop. The sad experience of the early sixties, during Khrushchev's time, graphically showed that belittling of the party's role may lead to unpredictable consequences.

We clearly remember when party committees were created under economic organs in agricultural administrations. The party raykoms were eliminated. The party was divided into an industrial party and a rural party. And we clearly remember how this ended. It led to a crisis in the economy and in politics.

The attitude toward local party organs also arouses perplexity and concern today. Attempts are being made to undermine their authority. Objectively, it must be said that the press and all the mass media have done a great deal for restructuring. And I think they will do still more. And we positively evaluate the role of the press and all the mass media. But if you analyze recent articles in newspapers and journals, you might conclude that the main opponents of restructuring are local party organs, especially party obkoms and raykoms. (Applause)

I would like to ask this: Who apart from party organs is today really engaging in restructuring at local level? Is it the loudmouths who are parading through the streets with dubious slogans and suggesting that some sort of commissions or committees to promote restructuring be created, or even that a new political party be set up, as has already been mentioned here? (Applause)

Or take the criticism of land reclamation. Some newspapers have recently made a clumsy attempt to portray a semblance of debate on these issues. But in fact it is just one-sided criticism, and even a settling of accounts, a hindrance, and damage to our common cause. (Applause)

We believe that such phenomena should not be treated simplistically. A clearer and more principled stance by the Central Committee is required here. The CPSU Central Committee must also set an example in switching to political methods of work and to the separation of functions. We are now overcautious in many respects and supplant state organs. For instance, it is quite

incomprehensible why the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat devotes a large share of its time to examining questions of awarding honorary titles, orders, and medals and other questions that are within the competence of state organs of power. We must get rid of the abnormal phenomenon whereby the CPSU Central Committee holds conferences and adopts resolutions on purely economic questions.

Even during the period of discussion of the theses conferences were held on the mixed feed industry and the chemical industry, and we Communists were asked at party meetings: Can't the Council of Ministers resolve these economic problems?

M.S. Gorbachev: Well, they haven't yet restructured themselves—there's work to be done.

V.I. Kalashnikov: In general, everyone must restructure themselves, Mikhail Sergeyevich. We at local level must restructure, and here too there must be restructuring.

M.S. Gorbachev: Correct, absolutely correct.

V.I. Kalashnikov: Comrades, 3 years ago the party Central Committee firmly and resolutely summoned Communists and all Soviet people to radical changes in economic and social life. The new course and new political thinking have met with nationwide support, people have trusted us. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report is a program for restoring the Leninist face of socialism. It inspires confidence that the great hopes that the Soviet people pin on the present party conference will be vindicated. At the same time people expect us to take more resolute, purposeful, and specific action: to carry what has been begun through to victorious completion. To that end we must finally abandon demagoguery and empty talk, rely on real transformations and specific deeds, not support departmental, narrow professional, and egotistical national interests, and show concern for strengthening the state and for the spiritual improvement and material prosperity of every Soviet person. Only thus can our party assert its role as political vanguard of our society. (Applause)

Karpov on 'Brawling' Criticism

PM3006124188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

["Speech by Comrade V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board," at 29 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! In summing up the time since the 27th congress, I cannot say that writers have gladdened readers with books on the scale of "War and Peace," "Quiet Flows the Don" and so forth. All the same, books have been published during this short time which have attracted the universal attention of readers not only in our country but also abroad. You will recall Rasputin's "The Fire" [Pozhar] and other recent books of his, Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat" [Deti Arbata] (noise in the hall).... Well, it is up to you whether you like them or not, but I say that these books have attracted attention.... Aytmatov's "The Block" [Plakha], Dudintsev's "White Clothes" [Beliye Odezhdy] as well as books by Astafyev and Belov, verses and poems by Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, Yegor Isayev, and Andrey Voznesenskiy, verses and songs by Vysotskiy and others among our literary artists. These books were not written in an inspired flight of renewal, and their driving energy is directed against the times of Stalin's mocking of the people and of socialism. But you cannot deny that they foresee the changes which have now arrived. And they all work for restructuring.

If we judge the attention which our literature as a whole enjoys today, it is reflected in the print runs of our literary journals and newspapers, which have increased several times over.

It may be said that literature is working well and actively for restructuring in many areas, and our journalism is particularly active and fruitful. This can be seen by everyone and is recognized by everyone.

Accumulation and mental work are presently taking place in the larger-scale prose genre, which requires time for interpretation and artistic embodiment, and this will undoubtedly be embodied in novels and stories in the near future. Readers are waiting patiently and with understanding, but some people are already asking me in letters: But when? Isn't it time? I share this desire of readers, but I also understand my prose-writing colleagues. We are still short of not only time but also results. I find support for this opinion in those same readers' letters. They ask hundreds of questions: Are we going the right way, what will come of all this, are we acting correctly to resolve many problems? In general, we will still have to wait. In the literary field, where novels and stories have to grow, not only are there already shoots but in some places ears have even begun to form.

But we have a genre in which, I would say, it is not ears but voices that have begun to form. I mean criticism. We have already heard several speakers talk about this.

In addition to serious analytical articles and reviews, many voices have, most regrettably, been heard shouting in criticism like a row in a communal kitchen. It has to be admitted that not only critics but also representatives of all genres are involved in this unseemly brawling. And group passions, old grievances, and, I would even say, our own hangover from the past that has come about under Soviet power constitute the driving force here. Many critical articles are written with a view to "destruction," and their authors think that such a style creates for them a reputation as a vigorous restructurer. There is a kind of logic in this: The louder the shouting and the more outspoken the abuse, the more attention is attracted: What a bold, original guy!

For many years after the October Revolution we referred to survivals of capitalism and the legacy of the past to account for various vices. Now we have seen that many of our own survivals have taken shape, some of them during the Stalin years—intrigues, denunciations, slander, and lies. Much was written at that time for the purpose of destroying people, most frequently honest people who could not defend themselves against the bullyboys and lickspittles of that time.

When I read malicious, unreasoned, bilious articles today, I see in them the same denunciatory style and the desire to compromise and "destroy" a person. (applause) Literary analysis and arguments are almost absent from such articles, and all efforts are directed toward political compromising and sticking on some label. And whereas it is possible to understand the perpetrator of this vice—this is how he was brought up, this is his instinctive reaction—it is quite impossible to understand the editorial boards which agree to print such relapses into our own already thrice-accursed hangover from the past. (applause)

With the start of restructuring we are getting rid of many mistakes and shortcomings. But, unfortunately, this vice has intensified with the coming of glasnost. This is happening because some people understand glasnost as meaning that everything is permitted. Glasnost in our criticism is becoming plainly one-sided, unilateral, and group-based.

Press organs have dispersed to group camps and are waging a real internecine war. We must not close our eyes to this, because it is already doing tremendous harm to the uniting of literary forces and the fulfillment of the chief tasks, that is, to the emergence of the works which the people so await from us.

In the line of duty I have talked many times with representatives of the so-called "right-wing" and "left-wing" forces, as they are traditionally called. Every struggle has its goals. I wanted to ascertain just what are the final goals for which these belligerents of ours are striving. I ascertained that they are not just personal, not just some kind of human sympathies and antipathies or differences in literary views and tastes. These do exist as well. It has been so in all times. But, apart from everything else, there is also a struggle for power going on, for mastery of press organs, and for leading posts, careerist ways, the quest for popularity, envy, and other things, even nationalist manifestations. If we do not struggle against this, the misfortune will escalate into major failures, above all in ideological education work. Instead of uniting forces to implement restructuring, there will be disunity. In talks with readers I can already see today that they too are dispersing to our group camps.

How are we to struggle against this? A means exists. It has long been known. V.I. Lenin said of criticism that every critical article will be of benefit only when the facts have been checked and measures taken to eliminate the shortcomings which are being criticized, and in any case—whether or not they have been confirmed—answers to criticism must be published. (applause) This is what our criticism lacks. It is one-sided. The play is all in one direction, as the saying goes. If one of you is lashed unjustly, just you try to wash yourself clean. None of your arguments and facts, even the most persuasive ones, will be published. (applause)

At secretariat meetings in the USSR Writers Union and in our everyday concerns we have repeatedly said that newspapers and journals must be obliged to observe this Leninist principle. Let everyone who is criticized keep quiet and put himself to rights, as the saying goes, if he has been correctly criticized. But if it was incorrect criticism, everyone must have an opportunity to reply, explain, and cite his own arguments. However, this talk of ours is still proving fruitless. The USSR Writers Union Secretariat has clearly failed to cope with this task and been unable to find, strange as it may seem, a common language or any useful forms of mutual understanding with editorial boards and editors. Strange though this really does appear, as both the USSR Writers Union Secretariat and the editors and journal editorial boards of journals are headed by Communists. And we cannot find a common language! Clearly, what is needed here is firmer leadership and exactingness on the part of the propaganda departments both of the CPSU Central Committee and of the union republic communist party central committees. (applause) If editorial boards know that they will definitely have to print a reply to their critical articles, they will check the materials better, there will be more responsibility, and, in the final analysis, there will be both benefit and justice. Glasnost is our achievement, glasnost is the driving force of restructuring, but it is universal and must on no account be given over to anyone's individual possession. (applause)

M.S. Gorbachev: Otherwise, certain of our little empires are swapped for others. But this is a rostrum of the whole people. (applause)

V.V. Karpov: I hope, comrades, that you realize that life in the USSR Writers Union does not consist only of what I have been speaking about. The improvement of our work, the elimination of what hinders creative deeds—these are our concerns. On the whole, writers wholeheartedly both want to work and are working in all spheres of our restructuring: in international problems, in the struggle for peace and disarmament. You see perfectly well to what extent and where we are involved in the struggle to save our country and the whole planet from ecological disaster, show concern for reviving Leninist norms of life and state structure, improving education, and enhancing culture, and participate in resolving many other contemporary problems. But we have not gathered at our conference to compliment one another but to conduct an honest, open, party-minded discussion and ascertain what is hindering us and what

will help us to implement grand plans. Therefore permit me to express in the same critical spirit a few more views which go beyond literary problems.

I cannot fail to mention our attitude to history—a question which excites the minds and hearts of all Soviet people. We need the truth about everything, the full truth, and not just the bitter truth but also the truth which mobilizes and makes people strong. (applause) The truth of history must be just like the fate of the people! But some people would like to suspend the process of the search for truth and strike out the whole of the past with a clear black cross. We must not repeat our own mistakes, comrades. We already have the shameful experience of the RAPP [Russian Association of Proletarian Writers] period, when people wanted to throw Tolstoy, Pushkin, Repin, and Glinka onto the garbage heap of history. And unique architectural monuments were demolished or blown up just because their domes were topped by a cross or a crescent. It is time we got away from such barbarous experimentation with our peoples' works of history and art. (applause)

And since we ourselves thoughtlessly and maliciously perpetrated what I am speaking of prior to Stalin's barbarities, these capacities of ours must not be forgotten in the period of our new revolution. Supposing we get carried away in some respect again! Lenin's lessons in the struggle against "tailism" and the infantile diseases of "leftism" on the communist path are an excellent mainstay for us in this. And since I have touched on a most tragic period in our history—Stalinism—I will say firmly as someone who knows from his own experience what repression is like: The victims of Stalin's tyranny rule—both living and dead—are voting today for restructuring and for socialism, because the apostates and traitors to Lenin's cause have been unable to forgive them their allegiance to the Leninist concept of socialism, democracy, and freedom and their personal dignity. (applause)

Correctly understanding the specific nature of artistic creativity, we do not now demand of writers and cultural figures works on restructuring cooked in a pressure cooker. Nor should we demand the impossible of scientists. We want truthful, profound research, not more opportunist trifles. We must not sit with arms folded, but rushing on in science is also an unproductive method. The chief thing is that the people should not make the same complaints against us all tomorrow as we make now against our predecessors. Enough of trying the people's patience, kindness, and obligingness!

It is an open secret today that red tape is one of the chief enemies of restructuring. We rightly hit out at bureaucrats. But here too, as frequently happened in our past, an excess has, in my opinion, become apparent. An equals sign can be perceived between the bureaucrat and the leader. This happened before. The older ones among you will recall how people used to condemn and shout: "He's wearing a hat," "He's put on a necktie"! You will recall the thirties. There is something similar today: "He travels by car," "He's gotten a leading post"! It does not matter that a person devotes all his strength and health to the cause: Since you are in a leading post—even though you were appointed yesterday—you are already a bureaucrat. (applause)

A bureaucrat is a bad, heartless, stagnant leader. But is it really possible to manage without leadership at all, without management in any sphere? That is idealism leading to anarchy. So let us here at the conference work out, adopt, and approve laws of party life which will be the basis of the mechanisms of the struggle against red tape on the one hand and the strengthening of the leader's authority on the other. (applause) The report said a lot about this. And these fine ideas must be confirmed by a revolution which every Communist—from the rank and file to Central Committee secretary—must fulfill.

It is said that he who does nothing makes no mistakes. We are doing a great deal, but this does not give us the right to make lots of mistakes. Let us learn from past bitter experience, comrades, and build real socialism and a real socialist society—so that no one after us has to restructure it again. This time the people have believed our party. But this evidently is already really the last chance. Either we at last build a real socialist society or.... In general we must do everything to prevent this "or" and not disgrace ourselves before our people, all mankind, and history. (applause).

Speeches Summarized

LD2906141688 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Excerpts] The 19th National Conference of the Soviet Communist Party continues in Moscow for the second day. This morning the delegates resumed the discussion of the report made yesterday by Mikhail Gorbachev. [passage omitted summarizing the report] It is also proposed to elect the first secretaries of party organizations to the post of chairman of the governing councils in the cities, regions, and districts. One of the delegates, Academician Abalkin, in his speech recommended not to hurry in accepting conception of dividing the functions of party and government leadership.

Another delegate, the [first] secretary of the party committee of the Altay Territory, Felipp Popov, proposed looking into press reports that several persons found to be involved in bribery were elected to the conference. The proposal was accepted.

The delegates were very critical when they spoke about economic and social development in the country. It was pointed out that sweeping economic reform which is being carried out in the course of perestroyka has not yet produced the desired results. The speakers agreed with what Mikhail Gorbachev said about the situation changing for the better slowly if one goes by living standards.

A worker from Leningrad, Smirnov, spoke about the housing shortage and Yevgeniy Chazov, minister of health, sharply criticized the situation in the health service.

The discussion on the report is being conducted in a democratic and businesslike manner. The attempts of some of the speakers to boil everything down to simple accounts and praise what has been achieved evoked a noisy reaction in the hall. The delegates demanded that they speak to the point.

Support is expressed for the main idea of Mikhail Gorbachev's report, that is the need to promote perestroyka and democratization of the entire life in the Soviet Union. [passage omitted further quoting from Gorbachev report]

It has been suggested to limit a person holding an elected post to two terms. A third term would be allowed in exceptional cases. Academician Arbatov suggested that there be no exceptions. [passage omitted further quoting from Gorbachev report]

Leningrad Worker Smirnov Speech

PM3006141188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 6

[Speech by V.P. Smirnov, radio equipment regulator at Leningrad's V.I. Lenin Optical Mechanics Association, at 29 June morning session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrade Delegates! Each of us here in this hall can certainly confirm the tremendous impatience with which all Soviet people have been awaiting the opening of the 19th party conference. In preparation for the conference, I visited many enterprises in the rayon and closely read the materials published in the press. And what worries me? There is a tremendous wave of criticism of all and sundry in the past, but few businesslike proposals about the present, existing economic problems, and our prospects and future. If we all fell upon the economy with the same passion and fury and began to work in the way that we require of others, I think that the number of targets for criticism would diminish and we would certainly have an easier life. (applause)

While I share the fundamental tenets of M.S. Gorbachev's report, I would like to make a few points about some of them. During the discussion of the Theses, the working people of the rayon with whom I met voiced ardent approval for the proposals for a clear demarcation of the functions of party and soviet organs and for the full restoration of the role and powers of the soviets of people's deputies as organs of genuine people's power.

However, we must not allow the other extreme either. You read some articles now and feel simply amazed. Their authors link the sovereignty of the soviets almost with a duty to stand in direct opposition to the party. Some people are already tossing up the slogan: "For soviets without communists." Others begin to tremble when they hear of party influence in the soviets. The soviets cannot be allowed to become the target of a political game or of the satisfaction of some people's ambitions. In today's conditions of the democratization of our society I would regard the soviets of people's deputies as the socioeconomic and legal organs that most fully accord with satisfying people's demands and interests. It is with those party instructions that we will nominate our best representatives to serve on the soviets. (applause)

While supporting the Theses' tenet on really involving the broad working people's masses in administering all state and social affairs, one cannot help noting the paradoxical situation in which people elected onto labor collective councils find themselves.

Indeed, on the one hand, labor collective councils seemingly exist, and, on the other, the most important thing is missing: their legal foundation. For instance, today it is unclear who bears what kind of responsibility for any failure to fulfill the labor collective council's decisions. Today its status is rather similar to that of the Standing Production Conference, an organization which used to exist and on which very great hopes were also once pinned.

All these questions are immeasurably exacerbated during enterprises' transition to economic accountability and self-financing. From the example of my own association, Leningrad's V.I. Lenin Optical Mechanics Association, I can say that working people have very great expectations of the labor collective council, which was shown by the entire course of the election campaign. No, that was not a slip of the tongue, I did indeed say the election campaign held in our labor collectives. As a result, a 24-member council including 22 Communists was elected, and elected without any quotas. We see this as a display of great trust in party members. And now, of course, we are not sitting idle. We have begun to act. But act as we see fit. Clearly, without a legal basis all our actions can be questioned by bureaucrats of any rank. And not only the prestige of self-management in the collective but also the prestige of Communists and the prestige of the party through whose efforts that self-management is implemented as one of the most vivid manifestations of our society's democratization will suffer.

During the present days and months the work to switch most enterprises in our city to the new lines of economic management is entering its decisive phase. Our country's economic well-being and, I repeat, the prestige as a whole of the party that has put forward the idea of renewing the economic mechanism depend on how successfully this process goes. In my view, disturbing symptoms are already visible now. The Law on the State Enterprise contains clear contradictions. On the one hand, it says:

The state is not answerable for the enterprise's commitments and the enterprise is not answerable for the commitments of the state and also of other enterprises, organizations, and institutions. But on the other hand, the very concept of independence is still extremely hypothetical since the old, outmoded relations with superior organs, which are refusing to let go of their opportunities to order the enterprise about, continue to dominate.

The enterprise at which I work is switching to full economic accountability next year. Our collective submitted specific, checked calculations to the ministry. These indicate that a strictly determined sum of the profits that are made should be left at the disposal of the Leningrad Optical Mechanics Association so that it can live and work normally. But the ministry is reducing this sum by 25 percent by means of strong-arm pressure. It is perfectly obvious that, given this approach, we will encounter insurmountable difficulties in resolving social questions. Our collective is already short of R30 million for solving the housing problem. So what chance is there of fulfilling the "Housing-2000" program in such a tightly regulated framework?

I am not just after an easy life. Clearly, today it is necessary to work immeasurably better than we did yesterday. And the association's working people will try to demonstrate this in reality. But if people higher up disagree with the labor collective council's decision, then clearly the superior leaders should visit the scene and investigate matters there, with the participation of party organs, in the light of the interests of both the sector and the enterprise. I can state with the utmost responsibility that the interests of the sector are not an abstract concept for us and people will always support a sensible stance by the ministry.

All party decisions are ultimately implemented in primary party organizations. So I want to touch on an important tenet of our conference's theses, namely, the one regarding the serious restructuring of their activity, since I myself was until recently secretary of the party bureau of a large shop organization. Today it is perfectly clear, for instance, that the primary organization must have the main say in questions of admission to the party. It is capable of determining itself a person's worth and dedication to communist ideals, especially as the opinion of the labor collective in which the applicant for party membership works is now taken into account. As a worker, I believe that the established view regarding the admission of engineering and technical personnel to the party, at least those of industrial enterprises, does not accord with the demands of the time.

Now a few words about the proposal for the certification of Communists contained in the theses and in M.S. Gorbachev's report. I will be blunt; I am against certification. Why? First, there is the fear that today this certification will be turned into another formal campaign. And second, I am against it because I consider it badly timed. In my view, every Communist must be given the opportunity to show his mettle in the revolutionary cause of restructuring. And the decision on certification should be considered at the 28th party congress. (applause) The party has plenty of statutory methods and means of getting rid of dead wood now.

When speaking of the activity of primary organizations in conditions of economic accountability, it is also necessary to think about ensuring that party organizations have their own financial base. I think some of the money from party dues must be left in the organization. (applause)

I would like to express my attitude to a question that is now being actively raised both in the press and among the public. Vladimir Vasilyevich Karpov just made some very good remarks about Stalinism. I want to talk about the restoration of the historical names of cities, streets, and enterprises. I think there must be just one approach here: In all cases this must be determined by a broad study of public opinion, by true popular memory, and must be based on profound historicism and considered and honest assessments.

The atmosphere of democratization and glasnost has opened up the opportunity for us to turn to tragic pages in our history, the years of the repressions of the thirties and the fifties, without any omissions or prohibitions. Leningraders, among whom there are still many people whose knowledge of this is not based on hearsay but who suffered during the period of lawlessness and lost relatives and comrades, particularly took to their hearts the letter from delegates to the 19th party conference entitled "Perpetuate the Memory!" that was published in the Leningrad press. The authors proposed that a collection of voluntary contributions for a memorial to the victims of Stalinism be organized. In supporting this public impulse, the Leningrad party organization believes that the erection of such memorials must and certainly will be not only a material contribution to forming a strong stratum of popular memory of the grim times but will also serve the cause of deepening and developing democratic principles in our society. (applause)

Arbatov, Zaykov Speak

LD2906190388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Excerpts] For the second day, the 19th all-union party conference is working in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. The morning session began with a report from the Credentials Commission given by its chairman, Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He reported that the Credentials Commission had examined the credentials of all 5,000 delegates and had certified them to be valid. The delegates confirmed the report by the Credentials Commission. Then they continued the

debate on the report by the CPSU Central Committee devoted to the progress in implementing the decisions of the 27th party congress and tasks to deepen restructuring.

Taking part in the discussion on this question were Kalashnikov, first secretary of the Volgograd Oblast party committee; Karpov, first secretary of the board of the USSR Union of Writers; and Popov, first secretary of the Altay Kray party committee.

Radio listeners have had the opportunity to learn in detail about the speeches of these delegates in our earlier broadcasts. The discussion at the conference is lively and democratic. Delegate Popov, for example, requested that the situation be clarified with respect to an article in the last edition of the journal OGONEK, where some unidentified conference delegates were accused of taking bribes. Comrade Popov reminded people that in the speech by the chairman of the Credentials Commission, this fact has been neither confirmed nor denied. Comrade Zaykov, Politburo member, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow City party committee, proposed that the Credentials Commission sort matters out and report to the conference.

Next to speak in the debate was Delegate Smirnov, a radio-apparatus regulator of the Leningrad Lenin Optical-Mechanical Association. [passage omitted]

After Comrade Smirnov, Comrade Arbatov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and director of the USA and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, spoke in the debate. Here are excerpts of this speech:

[Begin Arbatov recording] This is what I'd like to begin with: The tone of the report at this conference is not directive in nature, but an invitation to a self-critical discussion, just as the majority of speeches in the debate differs strikingly from that to which I, and people of my generation, grew accustomed. We have had so many occasions to rejoice—or to give the impression that we are rejoicing when things were going badly. And when they began to go better, to rejoice even more, afraid even to question ourselves as to what great price we were paying for this success or that.

And today, the hour of great changes has come—incontrovertible changes, positive changes—the hour of a return to the truth, of the resurrection of concepts such as honor and the worth of the individual and the nation. Nowadays, true meaning is being required by the concepts of patriotism and popular power, which for all of us had been painstakingly worn out and (?overused). At last people are straightening up, beginning to speak freely, to take a real part in politics; in a word, doing things of which we formerly dreamed. And we are not shouting hurrah and long live. We understand that only the first steps have been taken. Not only have we become more honest, cleaner—both morally and ideologically—but more certain of ourselves, of our strengths and possibilities. This certainty is built not on illusions, but, on the contrary, on the truth, even bitter truth. I think that this is a great result. It is rather like rocking and moving an enormous bolder. It will also be hard in future, but all the same, things are moving, and now we know it.

In light of such an understanding of the main results of what has already been done, I would like to comment on two matters which drew attention to themselves during the debate. The first concerns the thoughts about our economy expressed by Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, a respected—profoundly respected by myself—specialist and economist. I fully agree with him that many very complicated, difficult problems remain in the national economy. This has also been mentioned with sufficient clarity in Mikhail Sergeyevich's report. And I could add (?much) to what he said. But I have gained an impression—perhaps the wrong one, but his words have given grounds for this—that the note has also been sounded that in over 3 years there has been no success in achieving anything, and that the economy has remained in the same stagnant condition. I decisively disagree with this.

And it is not just because his conclusions appeared unconvincing to me. I don't think that successes or success in economic life today are determined by fractions of a percentage, the reduction in resource-intensiveness [resursoyemkost], and in a very short period of time, or all the more, a percentage or two of the growth rate. It appears to me that something else again is more important. The economy and economic reform are not an economic matter alone, but a political and even ideological one of the highest order. In order to move the boulder of the economy, it was necessary to change a great deal in political conceptions and in the public consciousness, and in particular, to achieve a recognition of the role of the commodity and money relationships of the market.

After all, it was in the declining years of the stagnation period that attempts were made to finally drive both economic science and economic practice into the cul-de-sac of pseudo-Marxist (?conclusions). Is it really possible to forget how passionately many responsible workers routed any attempt to reanimate the economic methods of managing the economy? They grew beside themselves at the mere mention of the market, the Hungarian, Yugoslav, or Chinese experience. And if, in those days, we proposed the ideas of family contracting, cooperatives, or individual labor activity, did we not sense the heavy spiritual heritage of those times, and even after restructuring had begun? I have in mind the profound deviation which began after the memorable decision on unearned income; and how heavy it can be, to the present day, in the struggle with leveler-attitudes. Is it really possible to forget all this? I think that it would not be an exaggeration to say that we have achieved very significant results in the creation of the political, spiritual, and moral prerequisites for economic reform.

Thus, for the economy too, 3 years have not passed in vain.

The second matter which I would like to mention concerns glasnost and the mass media.

Of course it is also possible and necessary to criticize the newspapers, radio, and television if they so deserve. But it seems to me that in a number of speeches notes of nostalgia have been heard for the good old days of ideological comfortability, when the mass media were quiet, tame, and gentle, and it was very comfortable to work. But, comrades, have we really forgotten Rashidov and Medunov, Kunayev and Sholokhov, Grishin and the many cases of illegality; the quite savage, by our current standards, campaigns about the enemies of the people, the Mendelists and Morganists, the murdering doctors and the pseudoscience of cybernetics, and absurd, ruinous economic decisions like turning Siberian rivers around? After all, all of this became possible partly as a result of the conditions of a voiceless and obedient press.

In my view, the party's plan to clean up, to speak the truth—all the truth, even the bitter truth—in order to clear the obstructions impeding progress, and to assist the cause of the victory of socialism, is understandable. [end recording]

The speaker also expressed his proposals on political reform. He supported the proposals expressed in the CPSU Central Committee report, and he observed that structural changes are necessary. Comrade Arbatov demonstrated in an argumented fashion why, in his view, the highest leaders should not be elected for more than two successive terms. [passage omitted]

Arbatov Favors Two Terms for All

LD2906182688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1415 GMT 29 Jun 88

[From the "Conference Diary" program]

[Text] There was a discussion [at the CPSU conference] of the length of terms for which party leaders, and leaders in general, will be elected. We will now hear the opinion of delegate Academician Arbatov. I will ask for the recording to be switched on.

[Begin Arbatov recording] I think it is correct in principle for first secretaries of party committees to be subsequently elected as chairmen of soviets. But here we must give further thought to some questions, in particular to the question of whether access to leadership of the soviets should be closed off to nonparty people, say, for rayon and, perhaps, even in certain cases, oblast soviets. And at last year's January plenum we raised the fact that nonparty people must play a greater role in our life. In addition, we must give thought to ensure that no constraints are placed on this norm in this area.

With regard to elections, I think that if we are to make elections to the soviets truly democratic, we could perhaps try this practice later: The party committee should elect and propose perhaps two or three candidates, whom communists find acceptable as leader of the party organization of the rayon or oblast. At that point, the soviet could be given the opportunity to choose between them, not just to confirm but to choose. I feel that the political system will develop more broadly in our country and this is quite possible.

On the question of length of term for the top leadership, comrades, for the leadership in general, I think that two terms should be introduced and without any exception. [applause] Why? You know, one of our achievements lies in the fact that praise for our leaders has begun to be seen as being in very poor taste. I welcome that wholeheartedly. And I think that when comrades talk about making an exception for the very top rank, they do so in light of our current leader. I understand that. At the same time, though, we must not consider just one man when we are introducing a particular norm. We must look at history, too. And I think history teaches us that if Comrade Stalin had retired in January, 1934, after a 10-year term, even before the murder of Kirov, and if Brezhnev had retired in October, 1974, our country would have managed to avoid many great pitfalls. [end recording]

Azerbaijan's Vezirov Urges Ethnic Ministry

PM3006091188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 7

["Speech by Comrade A.Kh. Vezirov (First Secretary of Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee)" at 29 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Party Conference]

[Text] Comrade delegates! The entire country has long awaited an open and honest discussion in the spirit of Leninist truth about the destiny of restructuring and the further development of its revolutionary ideas. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, which contained the highly complex experience accumulated since April 1985, is a convincing reaffirmation of our party's resolve to persistently pursue the cause of restructuring and give it greater scope, dynamism, and depth.

Azerbaijan's Communists and working people warmly support this course and believe that there is no alternative to it. We see restructuring and moral cleansing as the sole and truest opportunity for getting our republic out of stagnation and resolving the problems that have built up over the years. Restructuring in Azerbaijan is linked with great difficulties—the burden of the past is too great. First and foremost, the distortions in cadre policy that were inherent in clannishness, parochialism, servility, profuse overreporting, and the abuse of official position had a demoralizing influence on the sociopolitical and moral atmosphere in the republic. For a long time serious shortcomings were permitted in the leadership of socioeconomic development, effective measures were

not taken to improve investment and structural policy, the distribution of production forces, and the utilization of production potential, and the scientific principles of the long-term planning and running of the rural economy were violated. While relatively high rates of production volume growth prevailed, questions of the development of the social infrastructure were undervalued.

Over the last 15 years, Azerbaijan's absolute lag behind average union living standard indicators has not only failed to diminish but has almost doubled. As a result of economic errors, around 250,000 people of employable age are currently not participating in social production. There is particular alarm about the growth in the number of young people in this category of the population. Many spheres of spiritual life have been deformed. Now that all this is starting to come out, the bankruptcy of the "red banner 5-year plans" and the impressive phrase "Azerbaijan is striding out" is becoming obvious.

The so-called Nagorno Karabakh question is also deep-rooted in the past. The roots and lessons of this question require thorough study, and we will pursue that study without fail. To be blunt, the situation in and around the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has become socially dangerous. Attempts to put our two peoples on a collision course are continuing. Demands—contrary to the interests of the further development of the restructuring and democratization process in our country—for the national and territorial setup to be reviewed, and the criminally tragic events in Sumgait, which have been angrily condemned by all Soviet people, have destabilized the situation in certain parts of Azerbaijan and Armenia.

The situation has been acutely exacerbated by the fact that thousands of Azerbaijanis living in Armenia have started arriving in our republic. Many Armenians have left Azerbaijan. This is being actively exploited by provocateurs, and there is a danger of a chain reaction.

The events have brought to the surface the long years of dissatisfaction among both Azerbaijanis and Armenians with their living, working, and leisure conditions and have been a protest against social injustice. Unfortunately, however, the rallies and processions have been attended not only by those who want to hear answers to urgent questions, but also by people who are backed by influential antirestructuring forces. These are corrupt clans and black market dealers who have joined forces with criminal elements. Speculating on the shortcomings we have already revealed, they are striving to nudge people into nationalist demonstrations.

Meetings at labor collectives and talks with working people repeatedly bear out how important it is to make a timely and fundamentally party-based assessment of any deviation from communist convictions and the principles of internationalism and socialist legality. We should seriously consider, comrades, why everything that is supposed to ensure renewal and impede the actions of the enemies of restructuring by no means always works in our party and state system. We advocate everything that strengthens rather than weakens socialism, that rallies rather than alienates peoples. (applause).

An enormous amount of blame for the events in and around Nagorno Karabakh lies with the former leadership of the republic and the oblast. By their politically incorrect line that infringed certain interests of the autonomous oblast's inhabitants, they prepared the ground for nationalist weeds to grow. We are engaged in resolutely rectifying the situation in the political, social, and economic spheres. And we realize that everyone who strives to undermine restructuring and spread seats of interethnic discord to other parts of the country has an interest in maintaining the unregulated, abnormal situation in the NKAO. (applause)

As a former diplomat, I would like to note—and I think that comrades currently working abroad will agree—that every time there were difficulties within our country, it made it very hard and awkward for us to do our job.

The appeal from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the working people and peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia, and his appeal for reason, responsibility, and a balanced approach were very timely in a complex and very tense situation. Azerbaijan's Communists and working people wholly support the CPSU Central Committee Politburo's principled and consistent line of improving the situation in the region as the only correct line that accords with the highest interests of our motherland and its peoples. (applause)

We consider the unconditional fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions on measures to accelerate the socioeconomic development of the NKAO in order to ensure the dynamic and comprehensive development of the region to be very important. Considerable work has already been done, and we must see it through without fail.

Resolute steps are now also being taken to develop contacts and restore the long-standing traditions of cooperation between the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples and the other peoples of the USSR. A plan for joint measures between the Azerbaijan and Armenian Communist Party Central Committees for stepping up working people's international education has been coordinated. An Azerbaijani proverb says: "Even in the heat of argument one should think of reconciliation." We have to live together on this earth, share our bread and salt, and look each other in the eye. And we must not allow the things that have united and will always unite our peoples to be destroyed! (applause) Incidentally, comrade delegates, I cannot understand how a situation could come about in which the leaders of two neighboring fraternal republics, who had for years seen the

situation deteriorate, not only did not bother to seek a way out together, but even failed to acknowledge each other. A "fine" example they set everyone else!

That is why we attach particular importance to developing personal contacts between the Azerbaijan leadership and Armenian leaders. You know about our meeting with Comrade Arutyunyan. We have now agreed to step up contacts with the leaders of Georgia, Turkmenia, Dagestan, and other of the country's republics, krays, and oblasts. We will strive to ensure that they cover all levels of party, soviet, and economic cadres and labor collectives.

Now, at a crucial stage of restructuring, it is even more important to prevent manifestations of artificial isolation and to avoid becoming introspective. On the contrary, it is vitally necessary to rally and consolidate all our society's forces on a principled, internationalist basis. That is why we wholly share the conclusion made in the report that there is no way other than to cherish the brotherhood and friendship between our peoples as the apple of our eye; attempts to set peoples of different ethnic groups on a collision course and to sow discord and enmity between them mean shouldering a heavy responsibility to the people and socialist society, not to mention the law.

Analysis of events shows quite obviously the lack of sophistication in the leadership and administration of the processes of interethnic collaboration. Only recently we set up a special Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee subunit and a Standing Commission for Questions of National Relations at the republic's Supreme Soviet. Indeed, the time has come to also assign the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities the function of supreme organ of power in the sphere of national processes and interethnic relations. In order to take comprehensive account and pay constant attention to ethnic features and the needs of various groups of the population, we would consider it expedient to set up an executive organ too—a union ministry or a state committee for ethnic affairs.

We wholly support the idea in the report of introducing decentralization and transferring as many administrative functions as possible to local level. This will make it possible to considerably galvanize the activities of all forms of national statehood and autonomy. Life demands that we strengthen the status of autonomous okrugs, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous republics and expand their rights—but in organic conjunction with our duties and responsibilities for all-union interests. Peoples who do not have their own state territorial formations should also be ably to fully reflect reflect and satisfy their needs.

There is a shortage of fundamental scientific developments in the sphere of interethnic relations. As is well known, many USSR Academy of Sciences institutes research the history and problems of the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. However, the state of and trends in the development of relations among our country's nations and peoples are studied very inadequately. The vacuum this creates is filled by pseudoscientific figures who often adopt nationalist stances. In particular, Caucasian studies have been neglected, yet the elaboration of the problems of the Caucasus could have a major integrating impact.

We have come up against a situation in which a number of disputed and moot issues in the region's history have become an arena for clashes of arrogance among scholars barely worthy of the name. And when party organizations in the corresponding republics—including ours—fail to make a principled assessment of manifestations of national narrow-mindedness, egoism, and various kinds of speculation, this leads to undesirable consequences: Immense harm is done both to science and to the cause of education. The development of events in the Transcaucasus has shown that certain scholars and writers whose works provide irresponsible interpretations of these very subtle, delicate, and complex questions have been guilty of this to a certain extent. Whatever problems are discussed by our scholars and writers, discussions—as the CPSU Central Committee Theses rightly say—are only fruitful when conducted on the basis of socialism and for socialism's sake.

We consider that the way to successful resolution of the problems that have built up in the republic lies in strengthening the cadre corps, galvanizing healthy forces, and radically restructuring thinking and the style and methods of activity. A number of leaders have turned out to be unprepared for work under the conditions of extensive glasnost and democratization, continue to live in the past, and only pay lip-service to restructuring. At the same time, competent and vigorous people devoted to the cause are often left in the background and cannot fully realize their potential.

It is bad that many leaders have gotten out of the habit of listening to people. We must correct this situation. The newspapers are publishing the phone numbers of the republic's leaders, who now often listen directly to complaints and proposals from working people and quickly find answers to them.

The question of selecting and educating new-style cadres who can implement restructuring has been posed in all its acuteness. We take as our cue the promotion and education of cadres who combine professional competence and communist conviction with social activeness and the ability to assess any phenomenon from all-party and all-state positions. We are counting on the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences to implement cardinal measures to restructure the system of the party political training of cadres, bringing it into line with the demands of the present stage of our society's development. It seems to us that the system for renewing cadres and exchanging them among republics, and between the

center and local party organizations, should be more logical and flexible. This good idea has been repeatedly put forward and supported in CPSU Central Committee documents. However, very little has been done in this respect.

Azerbaijan's Communists are well aware of all the difficulties and the scale of the tasks facing them. The republic has the potential to resolve them. We have model enterprises in industry, model farms in the countryside, and—above all—the people's desire to work for the sake of restructuring is great.

An enormous amount of work will have to be done to ensure that the republic's socioeconomic development and people's moral elevation correspond to the tasks of restructuring. Recognizing the extremely unsatisfactory position in which the republic's social sphere finds itself, we are defining priority avenues. Stress is being laid on meeting the population's need for foodstuffs, particularly by intensifying stockraising, and on building up housing and sociocultural construction rates and making a radical breakthrough in the people's health protection.

During the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses at primary organizations and labor collectives we saw for ourselves yet again how it is precisely these problems that are of concern to our people. And we decided to put these questions to a nationwide discussion and to examine them at party Central Committee plenums.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize the especial importance of further strengthening our party's leading role. The Azerbaijani people pin their hopes and their future on the Communist Party. And if today we openly recognize the mistakes we have made and honestly assess what we have done, it is for the sake of making our party more vigorous. The strength of the CPSU and its ability to lead society to the planned goal has been convincingly confirmed by the entire post-April period, when our party has successfully headed the renewal process. Only through the leading role of the Communist Party can we achieve the irreversibility of the transformations we have begun, and justify the hopes and expectations of the Soviet people. (applause)

Ulyanov, Gorbachev Exchange

LD2906161088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Speech by M.A. Ulyanov, chairman of the RSFSR Union of Theater Workers, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 29 June]

[Text] [Announcer] Debates are continuing at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on the CPSU Central Committee report devoted to the progress toward implementing the decisions of the 27th party congress and the tasks to deepen restructuring. Ulyanov, chairman of the RSFSR Union of Theater Workers, today took part in this discussion. He devoted primary attention to an analysis of the history of our party and state and to the search for guarantees which protect the process of renewal. Here is what he said:

[Begin recording] [Ulyanov] Do we today have such legal, juridical, political, and constitutional guarantees of rights and laws which would protect us from possible uncontrolled administration by the injunction—you must watch for this cult? Do we? No! We still have to make them, compose them, and decide on them. This is a vitally important task for us, for the people, and for the party, to seek out, whatever the cost, and to draft legal guarantees which will serve as an impassable barrier for any evil person who loves to issue commands, to intimidate the people, and to let blood. The fact that this is quite a real issue has been shown by the bitter and rather dreadful story of the article by Nina Andreyeva. This article surprised us. Many—not all, but many—stood to attention and waited for their next instructions...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Mikhail Aleksandrovich!

[Ulyanov] Yes?

[Gorbachev] She has sent a letter. It has just arrived here. They have passed it on and the members of the Presidium will read it. She insists she is right.

[Ulyanov] (?Well, there you are). But it has nothing to do with Nina Andreyeva; it concerns us. The fact that we took fright at her letter, that's what is terrible. [laughter and applause]

Once these instructions appeared people would instantly rush to fulfill them without thinking or wavering. Once something is written down in a newspaper, that means it is an instruction. Although one's heart ached, the overwhelming majority were rooted to the spot and awaited preoutlined plans. While understanding that this was wrong, they nonetheless waited, shaking, but patiently, obediently; as if doomed, they waited. And what if an article did not appear in PRAVDA, rousing us from torpidity, rousing the public silence, and expectations? What would our conference be like today! How deeply has obedience and mindless execution of orders eaten into us! One hundred and fifty years ago Aleksandr Sergeyevich wrote: Woe to the country where only the slave and the flatterer are close to the throne, while the singer chosen by heaven remains silent, eyes cast down. [applause]

I will be bold enough to express several suggestions. It seems to me to be essential at the conference, or after it, to create a special commission headed by the general secretary and composed of the broadest possible range of the people and scholars which would work out a system of elections, both in the party apparatus and in the state apparatus. I'm not trying to tell you what you already

know. I'm merely expressing my opinion. The experience of elections for the 19th conference revealed a pressing need for this step. Elections ought to reflect the interests of the people and highlight truly talented, bold, reliable, and competent persons. We need to propose and to vote; we do not need a small group to appoint and confirm. A sensibly worked out system of elections will rid us of the volu .arism of the apparatus and of the confusion which also exists in people's minds.

This is my second suggestion, over which I truly did not sleep all night, but I will say it: The proposal on terms of office in any post, both in the party and in state and economic work, is correct and vitally essential. But a proposal has appeared here envisaging exceptions to being proposed for a third term—that is, for 15 years. Fifteen years is a considerable period of time. You know, comrades, in areas in our country where a crack of an exception appears, in a short time the gates open and then people pass through in crowds, ever more and more exceptional. [applause]

For the sake of real democratization, for the sake of improving life, I propose that one term be considered the rule of the norm, while for a second term a candidate should be elected who has obtained no less than two-thirds of votes during secret voting and with the unfailing participation of a rival or several rivals who are also voted for. [applause]

But we need to retain Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as general secretary for a maximum term. Our democratic barriers are still too weak. [applause] Our democratic barriers are still too weak for us not to fear some kind of disaster in the form of the Father and Teacher [reference to Stalin]. We have faith in Gorbachev and, therefore, I propose that only Gorbachev should be chosen for a third term, as an extraordinary decision, because the party conference is in progress. [applause] This is an exception and not a rule, for a social revolution is now underway. In a revolution—what is it they say? You don't change horses in mid-stream; people ought not to be changed during such a most serious effort. I'll also raise one question now which will probably not be supported, but I'll be bold: I consider that editors of central oblast and kray newspapers, in the republics, those of republican and oblast newspapers, should be elected at congresses and plenums, thereby protecting them from the heavy hand of the oblast and republican leadership. Newspapers are too tied to local authorities and are, therefore, dependent and without a voice. But without the press, its freedom and its boldness, neither democracy nor glasnost are conceivable. [applause]

We have a one-party system. But in nature, after all, everything is arranged according to the principle of the battle of opposites. This is where we need the press, as an opposing force that can perform the role of an opposite if a need for this arises. There is one thing I do not understand. We proclaim criticism and self-criticism as a means of self-cleansing. Well, as far as self-criticism is concerned, things are clear; it is called self-criticism—that is, you criticize yourself. It's difficult, but it's tolerable. However, is anyone supposed to criticize us? Otherwise, we end up with self-criticism again. Throughout the world it is the newspapers and journals that engage in this, or rather, this as well. Who will criticize and cover the events, take the side of the weak and insulted, seek the truth, and simply keep a window open on the world, if not the newspaper or journal? That is what happens throughout the world; it is natural.

But how can one square a requirement to step up criticism and a strict requirement to shut a newspaper's mouth if it—heaven forbid—dares to criticize someone, if some journalist dares to criticize an elected person on the staff, as was recently said on this rostrum? You might lose your faith in restructuring in the wake of such statements. Throughout the world, the newspapers are always the sharpest weapon; but in our country, some comrades would like to keep all the press in their pockets. What restructuring can one speak of if newspapers are forbidden to be a mirror which reflects the whole of our world, in all its fine and by no means fine diversity? No, dear comrades, if restructuring is to be done, then we must also restructure our attitude toward the newspapers when they are pleasant in every respect. No, the press is an independent and serious force and not a timid servant of certain comrades who have become accustomed to living and leading outside of any control. It is against this that we want to struggle.

[Gorbachev] Well, Mikhail Aleksandrovich, this is such an important issue. I even see that Comrade Arbatov has already quoted me, my point of view, and not just my point of view but the Central Committee's report, since the Theses have been endorsed by the Central Committee, and the report is based on the Theses, concerning glasnost and criticism. I think that if we give this up, moving this process on—the process of glasnost, criticism, self-criticism, and democracy—then restructuring is dead; one could write its obituary today. So we must, without fail, be firm. We have adopted this path and we must go on.

We must take everything into account. First, this is a people's system, and the people should be participants. They should take part via the political process, via the opportunity, via any channels for expressing and presenting their opinion, for criticizing those they do not like, and so on. They must go through the school of participation in the government of affairs. That is clear, and that must continue. But later on, when Georgiy Arkadiyevich—you're sitting there somewhere—started quoting, he stopped half way. Meanwhile, the report says—(?that's not allowed, by the way)—that the press is a serious affair. When Ilich talked about glasnost, he said: Glasnost is a conversation to the point, without literary clever tricks [nayezdnichestvo]. [applause drowns out further words from Gorbachev].

You see, at the conference we need to come to agreement in an honest and party-like fashion. We are indeed talking about the fate of the country, about how we are going to live, and about how we are going to build relations. So at that time a monopoly evolved, and look at what it has led to. Now we see how stealthily, the nationwide rostrum, nationwide...[Gorbachev changes thought] We want a pluralism of views; he is such and such, there is this and that, and so on. There is a need even for an opportunity for this viewpoint to be expressed, to listen to another, and then the entire spectrum of moods and problems is clearer, the problem comes to a head. But in our country we get one monopoly, that old one, which we must tear down, but which we still just can't tear down. You see...

[Ulyanov, interrupting] In our country at the moment we have two monopolies. One is in the localities.

[Gorbachev] Just a minute. I'll support you, as it happens. Don't you hurry. [laughter] So, we do not need to replace one monopoly with another; one half-truth with another half-truth. We need the whole truth, like life itself. We will know it, and we will reorganize that life on socialist principles, on our morals, on our responsibility, and to please ourselves. In general, at the conference, when we are working out how we are to live, we need to think not about where am I going to be tomorrow, in what position will I find myself, but we need to think about the country, about the people, about the fate of the country. [applause] Then we will [words indistinct].

The people see a difference between the local and the central press. There are two differences here, not one. On the one hand, the press has embarked more slowly on the course of restructuring and has not yet fully unfurled the potential of glasnost and democracy. This is correct. On the other hand, it has also sometimes escaped the bad points which we have sometimes read about in our country. One can abuse a person in our press. Is this permissible in a socialist society? It is against this—if they want to substitute anything for socialist values [applause], or to humiliate a person, then this needs to be resolutely said in my view by the party and at the conference. We need to preserve glasnost and criticism as forms of constant existence and active exchange of views in our country, because without this we will not resolve tasks. In my view, we are not of different opinions, Mikhail Aleksandrovich.

[Ulyanov] May I ask you a question?

[Gorbachev] Please do.

[Ulyanov] Do you want there to be no mistakes—and indeed, making mistakes and insulting somebody or other (?belittles) all the press? Rather, as far as I understand you, you want to raise the level of the press, even if we make mistakes. There can be mistakes in this struggle. [loud laughter and animation in hall]

[Gorbachev] Mikhail Aleksandrovich, since we are saying that we, that everything which has happened in the past—and the main lesson is that the people were excluded from the processes of public life and the process of elaborating and adopting decisions—then today it is through political democracy—and that is what we are talking about—through the press, all the other things, and the public organizations that we must involve the people. So we cannot hand the newspapers, the rostrum of the whole people, over to be run by another group—there was one group, now there's another. That is what we are talking about, that is what must be... [end of sentence drowned in applause]. I do not see any difference of opinion...

[Unidentified speaker, interupting] (?None at all.)

[Gorbachev] I even welcome the fact that you started this conversation, because it has given me an opportunity to come into it, in fact, because there must be complete clarity in this. If anyone of us feels hurt, and we feel uncomfortable after something that is said—but it is truthful—then chew it over, go to people, start trying to throw light on things, (?be prepared) to think why this is happening and how to put things right. Otherwise, we will not get out [of difficulties]. Then our party will be living, and we, with a one-party system, will be ensured a democracy such as nobody who wants to pass themselves off as a model of democracy has even dreamed of—and there are many such people in the world at the moment. [applause]

[Ulyanov] I've got 1 and ½ pages left here—perhaps I can stop reading it now? [laughter]

[Gorbachev] Excuse me! I think that it is good that we have conversed, with everyone present.

[Ulyanov] It is quite just that the press is a powerful weapon. We must be able to use it skillfully in the interests of the people and the party.

[Gorbachev] That's all there is to it. [applause]

[Ulyanov] But it is a weapon which can also punish; that is also the truth. If justly, then that speaks for itself. What is there to argue about? [end recording]

Kachura Addresses Conference

LD2906182388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Speech by B.V. Kachura, member of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, at the afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 29 June—recorded]

[Text] Comrades: Questions of nationality policy have always been topical, but now they require special attention. Take this one episode—how the membership of the

commission in charge of compiling a resolution on this issue has been arrived at. It reflects the importance and acuteness of this problem. The problems of relations between nationalities, problems that have come to a head, have been brought into the open in a well-considered manner in the report. The peculiar nature of the situation that has taken shape was also taken into account. New approaches have been put forward. The need to wage an uncompromising struggle against any signs of national egoism and regional empire-building has been emphasized, and rightly so. I feel that a balanced, fully democratic approach to the implementation of the tasks of developing our own, unified, union state, national cultures, of satisfying more fully the requirements of national groups, will meet with the support of the delegates to the conference from all republics.

The republican party organization, which is marking its 70th anniversary, has always regarded the implementation of a Leninist nationalities policy, protecting it from various nationalistic attacks, as being of primary importance. As far as the Ukrainian people are concerned, the fundamental basis of the internationalist brotherhood of the country's peoples is sacred and unshakable.

Only an internationalist with ardent convictions can be a true patriot. Preparing ourselves for the upcoming plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which will be devoted to questions of nationalities policy, we are, from the standpoint of the present day, reconsidering and actually restructuring the work on the patriotic and internationalist upbringing of the people. We are striving to tackle the issues in a well-considered way, as an integral part of our social, economic, and political tasks.

It is very important that the report poses in a new way, from the point of view of restructuring, the correlation between centralism and democratism, with the emphasis on expanding the rights of local bodies in accordance with the principles of self-management, self-financing, and self-sufficiency.

In order to handle this task successfully, and in light of the unquestionable need to prioritize the country's unified national economy complex, we must, while working out long-term plans, take the economic structure and demographic trends into fuller account. We must also take closer note of the ecological situation in individual areas and, in particular, do additional in-depth work on the questions of siting major power engineering and industrial facilities.

The time has evidently come to pass relevant laws that would comprehensively define the rights and obligations of the union and autonomous republics. [applause]

Fedotova Discusses Education

LD2906165188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Speech by S.A. Fedotova, a school teacher from Perm, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 29 June—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Fedotova] On behalf of the Perm delegation, on behalf of the oblast's working people, I support the spirit and direction of the process of democratization, which has begun and the ideas of democratization which run through all the tenets of the report—the idea of the limitation and precise determination of the functions of party and soviet bodies, the idea of the restriction of the period a person spends in a post to a specific period, two terms. Comrade Ulyanov has just spoken and uttered the phrase: You don't change horses midstream, but all the same I think that two terms in office are quite sufficient, and Mikhail Sergeyevich still has time to manage to do what has to be done, and we will help him in this. [applause]

[Gorbachev] I've already said let's think not about those sitting here and about those who did not make it here, let's think about the country, the party and the people. We'll reach the correct decisions and these correct decisions will put everything in place: The people, with the participation of the people, of Communists, otherwise we'll get diverted on to what is convenient for whom.

[Fedotova] The work of the school is also the work of the party, There are questions the solution of which is of vital concern not only to schools, but to the whole of society. I am a teacher of history; understand my pain, bitterness and sometimes even shame, when I am forced to say that such and such a question is covered incorrectly in history textbooks, that this question is distorted and that does not correspond to historical truth. Why are we compelled today—and probably even tomorrow—to study the history of our own country, a main academic subject, from publications in newspapers and journals. These publications are also at times subjective and sometimes contradictory as well in covering the most important problems of the past, and of the future, especially the stages of socialist construction and the determining of the role and essence of society's political system. [passage omitted]

Marchuk Addresses Session

LD2906173688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Speech by G.I. Marchuk, member of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 29 June—recorded]

[Text] Under conditions of restructuring, the great civic responsibility of scientists and their acute receptivity to the problems and needs of society are more important

than ever. However, this is impossible to achieve without consolidating the healthy forces of our science on the basis of restructuring and without outlawing the lack of coordination deriving from the interests of individual disciplines, regional and other narrow departmental interests. The Academy of Sciences will firmly take this path.

I would link the creation of a new image of Soviet science to two strategic goals. They are, first, democratization in the work of all links of the Academy of Sciences, and, second, the search for new forms and mechanisms to organize scientific research. Science, more than any other sphere, needs a struggle of ideas, opinions, and approaches. Monopolism is more destructive here than anywhere else. Only contest, competition of scientific schools, and their broad international cooperation can create a powerful internal stimulus for the development of science.

The steps we have taken in this direction have already encountered resistance, so they are very difficult. We must ensure competition of scientific programs, ones selected by competition, and replaceability in all scientific-administrative posts right up to the president. We will be discussing this at the general meeting of the Academy of Sciences in September. But this requires broad glasnost, discussion, exchange of experience. Yet we feel acutely—now even more acutely feel—how we lack a weekly all-union newspaper specially devoted to science. The USSR Academy of Sciences is submitting a proposal to create one. This has been requested by scientists at meetings with conference delegations.

There are also other important questions of restructuring of academic science which are being stormily debated by the scientific public. In the report and speeches at the party conference there has already been mention of the fact that restructuring has not yet reached the lowest organizational links. This fully applies to the Academy of Sciences. It is especially important, comrades, for many years our institutes have extensively grown and some of them have now outlived themselves in the structure which seemed to us completely natural. A sharp transformation of the structures is now necessary. We have so far only taken the first steps, and it should be said that not all these first steps by our academy have been consistent. But we do not know the best way to go about it. We are probing, experimenting, scrapping what has been accepted. This is a natural process which is characteristic of restructuring overall in all spheres.

Let us think once more about the fact that restructuring is our country's launchpad on the threshold of its entry into the 21st century. It would be no exaggeration to say that the contribution of science will greatly determine the place and role of our country in the future high-technology automated world community raised to a new stage of its development. But this place and role will be defined not only by the fruits of scientific research but also by the scale of its practical utilization.

Urges Freedom in Science

LD3006023388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1704 GMT 29 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, has expressed grave concern [in his address to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference] about the state of affairs in science, noting that during the last few decades the links between science and the national economy and between science and education had been severed. Speaking especially about fundamental research, he cited these figures:

[Begin Marchuk recording] Our true potential in fundamental research is approximately five times lower than U.S. potential. The same can be said about expenditures for these purposes. In the United States it amounts to $15 billion annually, whereas in our country the figure is R2 billion. From this it is clear that our competition in science is becoming even more difficult. That is why we are constantly forced to catch up. The question of a material-financial base for science is a central one, but it is not just a question of finance. The genuine development of science is impossible without sufficient source and a high degree of independence, and a system of public links and relations. It should be free from petty tutelage and any kind of control from the management apparatus, have complete freedom to operate independently on all questions of both its own process and of the whole socioeconomic and political process. [end recording]

In order to discuss and solve vital problems, Comrade Marchuk submitted the following proposal: to set up an all-union weekly newspaper of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He spoke in favor of holding a special CPSU Central Committee plenum devoted to questions of the development of science.

Armenia's Arutyunyan Speaks

LD2906154288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 29 Jun 88

["Excerpts" of speech by S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, at 29 June evening session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Text] The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference is underway for the 2d day in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. There are debates on the report by the CPSU Central Committee. The evening session opened an hour ago. It is chaired by Comrade Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The first speaker was the first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. Here are excerpts from his speech:

[Begin Arutyunyan recording] Our republic has had everything in order to achieve vanguard positions in the struggle for implementing the party's new line. But it turned out that in many respects the period following April 1985 became for Armenia a continuation of the years of stagnation. A very paradoxical situation has occurred. The elan of the masses, their spirit of restructuring, and the active rejection of stagnant and negative phenomena ran against the conservatism of the republican leadership.

However bitter it may be to acknowledge that, it not only failed to head the masses but to a certain degree found itself in the back row and lost initiative. Moreover, it turned into a certain braking mechanism, although there was no shortage of empty talk about restructuring. Instead of responding correctly to just criticism, assessing the situation soberly, and getting down to resolving the tasks related to restructuring and renewal, the republic tried to get away with cosmetic measures, imitation, or by erecting a mirage of restructuring. A devaluation of socialist ideological and moral values occurred in a number of people.

Such phenomena as plundering socialist property, window-dressing, bribe-taking, a scornful attitude to the law, and consumerism have taken root. Republican communists and working people are well aware that sharp criticism of shortcomings and exposure of negative phenomena alone are not enough for implementing radical changes. A clear constructive concept and a program for implementing these changes are required. A program is required which would help us in the shortest possible time to pull the republic out of the difficult situation.

For many years, sore and vital issues, on which the social identity and well-being of people depend, were not being resolved. According to a number of indices in social development, Armenia holds one of the lowest places among the union republics. For example, the amount of accomodations, the number kindergartens, hospital beds, polyclinics, trade venues, post offices, and cultural establishments in relation to the population is lower than in the USSR. Many families, especially in Yerevan, still live in ramshackle and hazardous houses and in basements. We are marking time in food production. A large proportion of the able-bodied population is not engaged in public sector production. The problem of water supply is still serious, as is the ecological situation. The most important thing, workers told me at a meeting before the conference, is to create a healthy moral atmosphere in the republic. For us this is now the most important thing, indeed. If we succeed in this, then deeds will be fulfilled. And we are starting with this.

Comrades, our time is laying bare many difficult problems in the sphere of national relations, which, let's be blunt, have existed for a long time, but which we previously, as it were, shut our eyes to. The problem in Nagorno-Karabakh is one of them. I'll tell you frankly: We haven't yet managed to normalize the situation in the republic. It continues to remain tense. In a period that is difficult for us, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, appealed to the peoples of Armenia and Azerbaijan. This appeal was timely, comrades; it extended enormous help to the party organizations of our republic. The roots of the situation that has come about lie in a complex entanglement of historical, social, economic, cultural, and ethnic problems, and in perversions of national policy that occurred in the period of the personality and stagnation cult.

These painful problems were not generated either today or yesterday. They have been gradually accumulating, over the course of decades, without receiving not only the necessary resolution but even open acknowledgement. It was precisely the antidemocratic practice of suppressing information and indifference, the aspiration to brush aside actually existing acute and complex problems, attempts to drive them underground or resolve them by authoritarian methods, that have led to such an explosive manifestation of them today. It is precisely restructuring, and the organically linked democratization and glasnost, that have exposed the neglected state of these problems, and it is precisely only restructuring that at the same time creates the conditions and prerequisites for their open discussion.

We know that attempts are on occasion made to explain the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and the sharp reaction to them on the part of the working people of our republic purely as the actions of extremist groups which have lost control. Let's put it like this: This is a very simplified representation. It is scarcely possible, relying on such a representation, to defuse the current situation. I cannot omit to say here, comrades, that such explanations are painfully offensive to the national feelings of the Communists and working people of our republic; they even run counter to basic common sense. It is now urgently necessary to elaborate new political thinking on the national issue.

I won't be revealing any secrets here if I say that this question in our country is one that has been neglected. But in such a sphere of human relations as the national sphere, not a single serious problem can be solved without renouncing old-fashioned approaches and stereotypes.

What lesson can be learned from the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and around it? It consists primarily in the fact that one has constantly to keep at the focus of attention matters relating to the development of inter-nationalities relations, both at the all-union, the regional, republican, and local levels. Experience shows that inter-nationalities problems can arise in mutrual relations between republics. We are clearly aware that it is inadmissiable to artificially provoke such issues. We understand very well that in resolving them, haste and high-handed administration, in the words of Lenin, are particularly intolerable. At the same time, it is obvious that when such

problems have already arisen, and moreover stemming from real causes, it would be incorrect to evade their examination. We have to have a precise, well thought-out mechanism for resolving them on a democratic and constitutional basis.

The conference has raised the question quite correctly of the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities which is called upon to play the most immediate role in elaborating and implementing in practical national policy, and in monitoring the correctness of its pursuit in the republics and in the provinces. [end recording]

More on Armenian Official's Address

LD3006022688 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1704 GMT 29 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The evening session [of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference] was conducted by Viktor Petrovich Nikonov. He passed the floor to Suren Gukgenovich Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. Noting that restructuring was proceeding in a contradictory way, in an acute struggle between the new and the old, Comrade Arutyunyan said:

[Begin Arutyunyan recording] Our times reveal a host of complex problems in the sphere of relations between nationalities—problems that, to put it bluntly, have existed for a long time, but to which we previously, as it were, closed our eyes. The problem of Nagorno-Karabakh is one of them. The situation that has developed in Armenia and Azerbaijan has become an acute one. Serious damage has been inflicted on the traditional friendly and good-neighborly relations between the two peoples, which we value highly. A situation involving conflict in relations between nationalities has arisen in a number of areas. I will say frankly: We have still not succeeded in normalizing the situation in the republic. It continues to remain tense.

The roots of the present situation are hidden in a complicated jumble of historic, soicial, economic, cultural, and ethnic problems and distortions of the policy of nationalities in the personality cult and stagnation period. It is blasphemous to maintian that restructuring, democratization, and glasnost are the causes of these events. It is precisely the antidemocratic practice of silence and indifference, the desire ito brush away acute and complex problems that really exist, the attempts to drive them into the ground or solve them by authoritarian methods that have led to these explosive manifestations today. It is precisely restructuring, and the organically linked democratization and glasnost that have exposed the neglected state of these problems, and it is precisely and only restructuring that simultaneously creates the conditons and prerequisites for their open discussion.

We now that attempts are sometimes made to explain events in Nagorno-Karabakh and the sharp reaction to them by our republic's working people purely as the actions of extremist groups that have gotten out of control. Let us put it this way: This is a very simplified version. It is scarcely possible, relying on such a version, to defuse the current situation. I cannot fail to say here, comrades, that such explanations are painfully offensive to the national feelings of our republic's Communists and workers; they even contradict basic common sense.

What lesson can be learned from the events in and around Nagorno-Karabakh? Primarily that one must constantly keep at the center of attention questions concerning the development of internationality relations, at the all-union, regional, republican, and local levels. We must have a precise, well thought-out mechanism for resolving them on a democratic, constitutional basis.

All these political institutions that now exist need to be made more active, defining and cordinating national questions.

This questions arises, too: As is known, the present USSR constitution was worked out during the period of stagnation and unrealistic approaches to assessing the state of and prospects for development of Soviet society. As has already been rightly pointed out in our press, this left a negative imprint on many of its tenets and articles. It would be proper and timely if the party conference recommended that work be commenced on preparing a new USSR Constitution. This would fully meet the party's course toward completing the formation of a socialist legal state. [end recording]

Sokolov Conference Speech

LD2906190788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Speech by Yefrem Sokolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 29 June—recorded]

[Text] Comrades, in the atmosphere of democracy, glasnost, and genuine pluralism of opinions, given this clash of ideas and emotions, at times the social activity of people takes a turbulent and unexpected turn. Not infrequently demagogy tries to latch on to democracy on this wave. How are the genuine democratic processes to be separated from demagogic deviations and excesses? How does one learn to conduct not a monologue—moreover, not infrequently in a peremptory tone—but a dialogue that works on the basis of conclusive arguments and verified facts? How does one raise the level of all ideological and political work, which presupposes a high degree of confidence in the common sense and emotions of everyone? You will agree that these matters are

likewise not simple, and today there is unlikely to be a party organization that can state categorically that it has found the answer to these questions.

Communists of the older generations remember the slogan that was once very popular: Educate a new person. But this was not to be, in the period of the personality cult, or in the years of stagnation. Restructuring does not have such a slogan and, indeed, does not need one, for without any slogans it is changing the psychology and actions of the Soviet people. With every passing day their moral and social potential—roused as it has been by the ideas of restructuring—is growing in strength and demanding appropriate actions from the party organizations.

Not so long ago the head of a Belorussian works asked me what I thought is the difference between him, the director of an enterprise, and the secretary of a party committee. He replied: I can go on to the shop floor and say to a lathe operator, and milling-machine operator, or a fitter, do as I do, and show them straightaway. Whereas the secretary of a party committee can say: Do as I say. The works director picked a fight with the secretary of the party committee. He tried to reproach him with not knowing the basics of lathe or mill operation. There is no doubt that a mastery of some profession is important for a party worker, but that is by no means the main thing. I am convinced that the formula, do as I do, is of lasting value for a party worker of whatever rank in what is most important and most sacred to him, observance of the Leninist norms and principles of party life.

Nobody denies that among them there are still bureaucrats, suppressors of criticism, and people infected with party one-upmanship and careerism. But the party leadership, indeed, has spoken out on this for all to hear, and the party has embarked on an uncompromising struggle against degenerates and against those who, working in the party apparatus, pursue selfish goals. However, there are some who, taking advantage of this, would like to set the party cadres and the party organizations, which are the foundation of the party, against the broad masses of the working people. The working people say: Their attempts are in vain. No one has ever managed to do this, and nor will they. [applause]

Bondarev: 'Extremist Criticism'

LD2906202788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 29 Jun 88

[From the "Diary of the 19th Party Conference"]

[Text] After delegate Sokolov, delegate Bondarev, deputy chairman of the Board of the Writers Union of the Russian Federation and member of the Presidium of the Board of the Soviet Culture Fund, spoke in the debate.

He shared his reflections on the moral sources of restructuring and its influence on public life. Delegate Bondarev protested categorically against the numerous critical articles on the work of the writers Belov, Astafyev, Ivanov, and Proskurin. He noted that, in his view, such criticism was designed to destroy major figures in Soviet culture. The speaker also protested the situation taking shape in the literary journals and their criticism of one another. He noted that all this has a negative effect on the younger generation, with which he comes into regular contact.

A gram of faith is worth more than all the experience of the wise. Delegate Bondarev added: I have recalled that truism more than once when dealing with young people. We are betraying our young people with anarchic chatter, cheap sensations, and so on. Through the press, we are giving them not the truth, bitter though it may be, but a succession of disappointments flavored with cynicism, extinguishing the joy of youth. Our extremist criticism, with its despotism, lack of culture, love of power, and cynicism in the assessment of phenomena, seems to be above and ahead of the interests of socialist progress. It seeks to confer on itself the new title of restructuring's chief clerk.

In actual fact, the speaker continued, this criticism professes the following as its main postulate: Let every weed flourish and all the evil forces compete. Only through chaos, confusion, and an epidemic of literary scandals, and only by shaking belief to the core can we make a suit of thought tailored personally to ourselves. Yes, this criticism lusts after power and casts ethics and conscience to the brink of crisis. Delegate Bondarev voiced support for a huge cut in such critical articles.

Komsomol Leader Speaks

LD2906204188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 140 GMT 29 Jun 88

["Excerpt" from speech by Viktor Ivanovich Mironenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Moscow on 29 June—recorded]

[Text] Youth has supported restructuring. For the first time in many years the activity of young people is really growing, and not just for effect. Tens of millions of young people took part in discussing the CPSU Central Committee Theses. Comrades, just think, indeed this was in essence a referendum among young people on political trust, and the outcome of that referendum is clear. Youth's trust in the party has grown, and the atmosphere has become cleaner, more honest, and just. This is, of course, true but it is not the whole truth. The situation in the youth environment is complex and contradictory. Political apathy, mistrust, and frank delusion alike remain. Some of the young people are captivated by the revolutionary phrase. The reasons for all this, in my view, lie considerably deeper than juvenile maximalism or political inexperience and considerably deeper than what Yuriy Vasilyevich Bondarev was talking about.

We often hear the censure that youth is screaming. It is screaming from the stairs of the 12th story, it is screaming from the stage with a guitar in its hands. But we never stop to think why it is screaming. Man screams, he screams when he is born from physical pain, he screams when he becomes a personality from spiritual suffocation, from social pain, from the inability or impossibility to express himself in toil, creativity, in sociopolitical life.

First, it was youth that suffered more than most from the stagnation in society. On the other hand, our society started losing its dynamism precisely because there had been a slackening of the inflow of fresh forces, innovative ideas, new people, that is, everything that the rising generation embarking on life brings with it. Second, and this must be said honestly today at the party conference, the Komsomol is much slower than we had thought, than it might be, to emerge from the precrisis state in which it found itself in the mid-1980's. Third, despite the measures adopted after the 27th CPSU Congress, overall the social tension in the youth environment is not abating. Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev] is right. What is needed is a strong and integral youth policy. It is necessary to restore the Leninist principles of party leadership of the Komsomol. Real participation of young people in the adoption of decisions affecting their vital interests must be ensured at all levels, from the labor collective to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the CPSU Central Committee. For this it is necessary to considerably expand the representation of youth in all bodies of state power and perhaps also in party bodies, including the party Central Committee where there are only a handful of young Communists. Incidentally, indicative in this respect is the age structure of the delegates to our conference: 158 persons aged under 30 and only 47 Komsomol officials, Communists working in the Komsomol—that is, out of 5,000 delegates.

There is no land of milk and honey awaiting us but the inevitable difficulties of a period of transition. Youth could itself solve its problems with its own toil on its own initiative. But working youth has an average monthly remuneration 1.5 times lower than the rest of the population. We are so used to this that we consider it quite normal, but it is not normal. It is excessive wage leveling in the form of remuneration not for toil and intellectual contribution but for office, number of years worked and length of service, and so on. And, comrades, life itself corrects us every day. This difference is, in the final analysis, returned to the same young people in the form of assistance from older relatives. And I tell you frankly: Let adults feed their children right up to their pensions if they like, but that is not the point. The point is that precisely here is concealed the strongest brake on the acceleration of socioeconomic development. Here lie the roots of the apron-strings mentality and the lack of initiative and childishness. Here lies the huge and unclaimed potential of physical and creative forces so needed by restructuring. I do not understand how the Council of Ministers, the Gosplan, and Goskomtrud can fail to see this glaring error. What can and needs to be done now in our view?

First, support the reassessment measures included in the youth bill now being drafted and seek out funds for their implementation. Second, it is necessary at the State Statistics Committee, Gosplan, and the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, to create small subunits which might take part in the compilation of plans for socioeconomic development of the country, the state budget, at all stages of their preparation, monitoring and working for the interests of the rising generation to be taken into account. Third, a youth fund and social bodies' means and organizations of state funds should be created for the implementation of long-term programs and urgent measures directed at improving the social well-being of youth and the initial financing of its most interesting social initiatives.

Well, for instance: There is now an urgent need for sociomedical assistance for wounded internationalist servicemen. From the Social Inventions Fund [as heard] created by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, funds from Komsomol organizations are going to thousands of people, but rehabilitation centers, artificial limbs, wheel chairs, and very many other things are needed immediately and not in 2-3 years' time. It is also necessary to think how to alleviate, to compensate for the definite inequality, partly unavoidable with socialism, of young people from various social levels at the start of their lives. This is not utopian, comrades, but a quite feasible task, and the Komsomol-supported movement of youth housing complexes and system of scientific-technical creativity of youth, and the computer clubs and labor associations and much, much else are nothing else but links in a single flexible system of search and support for talented and dilligent youth. Real opportunity at the start of their life's road rests on their own efforts.

Ivanovo Director's Speech

LD2906210188 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1415 GMT 29 Jun 88

[From the "Party Conference Diary" program; speech by Vladimir Pavlovich Kobaidze, general director of the Ivanovo Machine-Tool Building Association, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 29 June]

[Text] [Announcer] We are going to show the speech by Vladimir Pavlovich Kobaidze to our television viewers. We sometimes talk of the times of stagnation, and so forth. But there were people at that time as well who, generally speaking, were preparing today's restructuring. Vladimir Pavlovich Kobaidze, general director of the Ivanovo Machine Tool Building Association, is a person who for 10 years was under pressure from all kinds of bureaucrats, who pressed ahead with his idea, and who has finally succeeded in creating an enterprise which manufactures numeric control machine tools which are purchased abroad and which approach the level of international standards, where machining centers are made. Over to that speech. I will ask for the videorecording to be switched on.

[Begin Kobaidze recording] Comrade delegates: I can feel the terrible burden of responsibility which has been placed upon me in connection with this speech, because I am the first of the 350 directors present here to burst through to this rostrum.

I have listened very attentively to all the speeches, and I tried to imagine both before and here what we will take back. It seems to me that the principal issue which we have to determine here is to work out a strategy that would be credible to our people. That applies, above all, to the economy, our most sensitive issue. It is precisely the issue with which we have the greatest amount of skidding. What can be done, in my view? I will not theorize, I am a practician.

A remarkable cause has been launched: self-financing. A process which is not easy, but complex. We knew that the way has not been paved for that cause. I remember when the general secretary invited us, about two dozen directors, to hold counsel. We said openly that nothing was ready as yet. But the transfer must be made, must be made. And now we can see. We work... [Kobaidze changes thought] We started earlier than others and transferred to self-financing. We can feel now how much other echelons of power lag behind.

There is a lot of talk about whether ministries should be abolished, and how many of them should exist. That is true. On the other hand, there is a paradox: No one else in the world has so many ministers as we do, but things go lousy. [laughter and applause]. But do not wait for me to make the statement: Let us abolish them tomorrow. You will see my point in a moment. I believe that the biggest trouble is that we lack consistency. We should represent... [Kobaidze changes thought] All should be transferred to self-financing.

In our time, not so long ago, we submitted the proposal that the Soviet power be transferred to self-financing. Roughly speaking, if I transfer 50 percent of my profits to the state budget, let us divide it in two, half to the region, and half for central needs. Well, it is a conventional figure, it must be calculated. Then, in the first column we will see clearly who brings and what they bring, and then the soviets will be in their place.

There is a lot of talk now that it is necessary to release deputies, just as in the United States. What are they going to do? Are they going to make rounds of Moscow offices or what? When we who work in the region will earn bread for the Soviet power, then and there you will have stormy debates. [applause] I believe that that issue should be resolved here, at the conference, without delay. It should be, moreover... [Kobaidze changes thought] There is a business-like proposal. Ivanovo is the birthplace of the first soviet in Russia. Let us start in 1989 with Ivanovo and other volunteers. [applause]

Now I would like to speak about ministries. Speaking frankly, even now we could... [Kobaidze changes thought] I do not need the ministry. [laughter and applause] We now manage quite well without it: We get the feed on our own now; we get foreign currency on our own. What can the minister give us? Nothing at all. But it does not mean that there is no need for coordinating centers: they are needed. But they should work; they should feed themselves off us and not off the budget. If the minister catches mice, we will feed him. [laughter] If he does not, as he wants! [stormy applause]

Comrades, science should be transferred to self-financing. I listened attentively here. Unfortunately, Guriy Ivanovich [Marchuk], a person whom I respect so much—I expected some sort of a bold, insolent proposal from him, and I did not hear it. Shame, Guriy Ivanovich! [applause]

I believe that we should transfer science to self-financing as well. Enough feeding off the central budget! [applause] I would like to illustrate. Naturally, there are—do not think, for God's sake that... [Kobaidze changes thought] Well, Comrade Shcherbitskiy is lucky: two, I believe, marvelous scientific sections, that is the Paton Institute and the Glushkov Institute. They can really show the example of the way to work. As for the others, no! Those who work excellently can be counted on the fingers of two hands. Although I am linked with scientifically intensive output, I need their products. And I do not think I have come across... [Kobaidze changes thought] So many of those scientific research institutes have been bred, in my own dear ministry. A Moscow Gorkom secretary spoke here, not in the best possible way. [applause] He wept here that we, poor Ivanovites, as it appears, should give even more to Moscow, something that has to be built.

An incorrect stance, an altogether incorrect stance. I have learned a terrifying figure recently: 900,000 scientific workers are in the capital. What is here, after all, a brain gathering? [laughter and applause] Here you are, here you have room for children's establishments, hotels, and other things.

Comrades, do not think that I want to give a good rebuke to science. I believe that we should find ways and methods. We are lagging behind. Why? I do not think I ever heard of South Korean Scientific Research Institutes, but look: South Korea is among the 10 best industrially developed countries.

We have many... [Kobaidze changes thought] What else would I like to speak of? Comrades, if we do not learn, observe how others work. Take a look: The entire organization of production in our country, everywhere, rests at the most primitive level. The principle of barter economy! Theoretically, we all study, and read lectures,

however bad. But there are no body movements, how to organize cooperation, how a machine tool building enterprise should be organized. Well, as for others, I will kick them later. [laughter].

Look here, all have reconciled themselves to such an extent with such idiocy that about 70 percent of all standards we do on our own. If you and I cannot cope with bolts, nuts, and screws, what kind of bloody restructuring will you have then?

I have read very carefully the stenograph transcripts of all the congresses, starting from the 17th congress. At every congress there was talk of this, of ordinary nuts and bolts and so on. They are right in saying: Wise people learn by their mistakes, idiots repeat them. Enough of them! [applause and laughter]

Comrades, it is high time we sorted out this bacchanalia in construction. Despite all the shortcomings in machine-building, there is no more infamous production and planning organization than the one we have in construction. Yet people have become reconciled to that. I do not want to go into too much detail on this thesis, but in our country it is considered normal to take 15-20 years to build a factory. Yet no one, after all, has shot himself; no one has gone out of his mind! [laughter in auditorium, and applause in presidium] As the general director of the Ivanovo-Pyongyang International Association, I can tell you how they build in North Korea: The same sort of building as is being built at my works, 50,000 square meters in 9 months, 9 months! The building at my association, one of the 27 major construction projects in the country, has been under construction for 8 years. I am afraid that I will be carried out feet first, and they will still be writing out chits on it! [laughter and applause]

I reckon the party should make a decisive condemnation of parasitical attitudes: We are all corrupted by parasiticism. Before I came up for the conference, I went around to all the machine-building enterprises in the city of Ivanovo, because I am the only engineer in our otherwise ladies-only delegation. [laughter] So I had meetings with collectives. Terribly interesting meetings, they were too, but what was typical was what people said: Comrade Kobaidze, go and get an apartment block out of them; do it for us. No question of earning it, mark you. That is typical. Our minister gathered together 27 congress delegates, wise directors, all the hard workers were given letters, and once again nothing but give us this, give us that, give us this. Honestly! I have not asked anything from the minister for years, and I will not ask for anything either! In the first place, it is humiliating. Everyone should earn things. But in our country these petitioners pleading poverty enjoy... [Kobaidze changes thought] You know, we love the lame and the needy, do not we, laud them to the skies? [laughter and thunderous applause]

You know, I just cannot stand all this bureaucratic paper-shuffling. At the 27th congress I declared that if every delegate did not tear up five or seven documents when he got home again, the congress would have been in vain. They grow like mad, the cursed things! [laughter] I have come to understand one thing: It is hopeless to fight paperwork; you have to kill off the authors! [applause] Let me cite a little example. Every month, every quarter, and every year the chief accountant comes to me. Just a little example, but it says a lot; that is why I want to cite an example of one document that everyone has to complete. The account report, the quarterly, monthly and annual account report. That is what it is like. I am a general director, an old workhorse. I need seven or eight figures in that account report. I ask where it goes: the Statistics Directorate, the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool-Building Industry, the finance organs? Now I can just imagine my own dear minister getting huge tomes from 400 enterprises. Who on earth analyzes them there? [laughter] If a general director needs seven or so figures? So you see how all these papers have us in a mortal grip. Is this really restructuring? Yet someone is sitting there and is responsible for it: Has he really restructured himself? [applause]

Comrades, I should not wish... [Kobaidze changes thought] Three years have indeed flown by quickly. As yet we have few successes in the economy. But if we have mounted the tiger of restructuring, we must not climb down, we must only urge it on faster. [laughter and applause] I am a maximalist by nature. Of course, I want passionately to speed up events. Everything is regarded in such a black light. Maybe that is necessary, the devil knows, that is probably how it should be. But I sometimes urge myself: Just look around. Indeed, if I had been told 5 years ago, I would never have dreamed that on my signature, my signature as secretary of the party committee, people travel, within 24 hours get their documents in order and go abroad. First of all, they go to the socialist countries, and now I can launch my lads all over the place. That I would have the right to purchase from and sell to every country in the world, without asking anyone's leave, operating on my own responsibility and at my own risk. If I had dreamed that I would be the general director and would conclude agreements with Soviet, Bulgarian, Korea, and GDR companies, I would never have believed it; it is impossible.

The director of my foreign trade firm had a nice surprise for me today. He telephoned me this morning and said he had just got back from the FRG. He had sold nine machining centers in the FRG and Switzerland: 3 million green dollars, he had brought back. [laughter and applause] Of course, for other comrades that is just chicken feed, but if someone were to tell me that half of that, 1.5 million, were mine, well now! [laughter]

Life is good, you know, all the same. Now is an interesting time. But when I meet many leaders... [Kobaidze changes thought] The devil knows what sort of habit we

have got into; everybody keeps waiting for some instructions or other. Everything has already been said. Everything has been said. Everything, indeed, depends today on getting down to things and getting them done. [applause] [end recording]

[Announcer] I remember now that 1-2 years ago we went to Ivanovo to film at Vladimir Pavlovich Kobaidze's works. When he met us, he said: My dears, where were you before when I was having difficulties, when I had to get my ideas across, when petty bureaucrats were getting on to me all the time? And now what? If we had 10,000 managers like Kobaidze, I think the victory of restructuring would be guaranteed.

Well, comrades, I hope that you have been able from this and other speeches to catch the spirit that prevails at the party conference today. Tomorrow we will be on the air again, broadcasting the Party Conference Diary at 1815. All the best!

Pugo Speech to Conference

LD3006020688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1704 GMT 29 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Boris Karlovich Pugo, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, began his speech [to the 19th All-Union Party Conference] with the thought that today the party must give a more active lead to perestroyka, be in its vanguard, without fear of recognizing its own mistakes. It is the party that today bears special responsibility for a thought out and balanced development of Lenin's nationalities policy:

[Begin Pugo recording] We are seeing in perestroyka not only individual people, but also entire nations, including the Latvian people, starting to show more social and political activity. We are feeling that people have a healthy disssatisfaction with what has been achieved. This growth in national self-awareness and the desire to instill order more quickly in one's own home will multiply the republic's contribution to perestroyka, and is finding support in the CPSU Central Committee.

In our republic there are also, unfortunately, people who are gambling on national feelings, firing passions, opening old wounds, and as a result inflicting new ones. Our road lies not with them: They lead to deadlock, while we want a rational solution to the problems that have indeed built up in the republic over the years of stagnation.

Residents of the republic are especially worried by the excessively large influx of workers from other regions and the serious complication of the ecological situation. We ourselves are to blame for a number of shortocmings. But quite a few problems have been caused by the boundless dictate of union ministries accustomed to taking with impunity their departmental interests to be those of the state as a whole. In the hunt for (?constant) profits, they literally apply force in their enterprises in places where there is already a developed infrastructure. As a result, they frequently do not improve, but worsen its condition and engender dissatisfaction among people irrespective of their nationality. Such departmental expansion augments ithe problems in any region, but in the conditions of a national republic it also complicates internationality relations. Recently they have been markedly exacerbated in our republic, too. Some people have been attempting to blame this on restructuring and democratization. We can in no way agree with that. It if far mor correct to say that these problems have come to the fore because a real opportunity has appeared for their oepen discussion and cardinal resolution. This is also confirmed by the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the conference, which convincingly stress the insistent need to restore in its Leninist understanding the Soviet Federation of Sovereign Socialist Republics.

In effect we need to create a new and more effective mechanism for relations between union bodies, ministries, and departments and republican and local bodies of soviet power. It is necessary to ensure the genuine sovereignty of each fraternal republic.

At meetings with the public in the republic where the platform and mandates of our delegation were discussed, quite a few other proposals wer made to improve the nationalities policy. We think they should also be reflected in a resolution on relations between nationalities in the country. I want to support the idea expressed in the report on a radical reform of the Soviet of Nationalities. In our view, the workers' proposals for the creation of a permanently operating body similar to the former People's Commissariat on Nationality Matters deserve thorough study.

Our delegation whole-heartedly supports the proposal by the CPSU Central Committee to hold a plenum on national problems, and proposes doing this as soon as possible. [applause] [end recording] [video shows Pugo addressing the conference, brief shots of the audience; some of the leadership is visible on the platform behind the speaker. At one point Gromyko speaks to Gorbachev. Solomentsev is seen in conversation with Shevardnadze]

Evening Session Concludes

LD2906223488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] The debate at the evening session of the 19th all-union party conference was rounded off by Comrade Pugo, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

Here is what he had to say:

[Begin Pugo recording] Departmental expansion augments the problems in any region, but in the conditions of a national republic it also complicates internationality

relations. Recently they have been markedly exacerbated in our republic too. Some people have been attempting to blame this on restructuirng and democratization. We can in no way agree with that. It is far more correct to say that these problems have come to the fore because a real opportunity has appeared for their open discussion and cardinal resolution. This is confirmed by the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the conference, which convincingly stress the insistent need to restore in its Leninist understanding the Soviet Federation of Sovereign Socialist Republics.

In effect we need to create a new and more effective mechanism for relations between union bodies, ministries and departments and republican and local bodies of soviet power. It is necessary to ensure the genuine sovereignty of each fraternal republic. Here we have in mind a substantial increase in the independence of union republics and a broadening of the rights of local bodies of soviet power in the development of the economy, the social sphere and culture. I emphasize that it is a matter not of some kind of isolation but of the realization of the rights proclaimed in the USSR Constitution and of a decentralization of government.

In a number of cases, of course, new legislative acts will be required. In this respect a number of constructive proposals ahve already been expressed that are in accordance with the view of the working people of Soviet Latvia, and we support them. It is quite possible that in the long term certain adjustments will have to be made to the USSR Constitution. For instance, in articles 73 and 74 it is necessary to define more precisely the relationship of Union departments and enterprises with local bodies of soviet power and to give soviets priority in the solution of many rpoblems. This is particularly topical at the present time. We are convinced of this by the speeches of conference participants and the proposals being made by many working people to the republic's leadership. They are saying this: If you do not obtain satisfaction from the departments we shall obtain satisfaction from you. What they say is right.

These matters have of late been the subject of a most thorough analysis by the Lavtian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's government. We have drawn up and submitted to the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers 84 proposals on extending the rights of the republic in the sphere of planning, finance, pricing and the development of the economy and culture. The cancellation of outdated instructions is sometimes enough for a positive solution. You know, the Union State Agro-Industrial Committee recently had the courage—true, by way of an experiment, to cancel the procedures whereby Riga confectioners were forced to send the recipes for new cakes to Moscow for its agreement. It did not have any bad effect. The prestige of the State Agro-Industrial Committee did not suffer, and the quality of the cakes did not deteriorate. There are other cases too, comrade ministers. It is surely not necessary to turn matters that can be easily resolved locally into Union problems.

We very much need the support of the CPSU Central Committee and the country's government in combating pressure from Union departments which by hook or crook are striving for construction work to be carried out in order to expand their production facilities in Latvia. Their requests for such construction work in the present and the next 5-year periods already exceed by R500 million the potentiality of our builders. Here it is quite possible that there will be a requirement even to revise a number of decisions previously adopted by the government. But one cannot get by without that. We cannot continue to attract manpower to our republic from neighboring oblasts of the Non-Chernozem Zone, which are already depopulated. It is time more strictly and from party positions to make the leaders of union ministries and departments answer for their adherence to the extensive path of developing their industries. They should be headed not merely by competent specialists but above all by far-sighted policy-makers. They must learn to see from their ministerial seats not only enterprises but the people who live near the enterprises and take their interests into account. Economics and party policy make it incumbent not to impose one's own will on regions but economically to interest them in the development of various industries. I think that the USSR State Planning Committee needs not only to limit unwise departmental appetites but also to think about changing the character of those enterprises, where a republic does not have either the raw materials or the labor resources to ensure their normal functioning. [end recording]

Gorbachev Speaks at Closing

LD2906152488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] The 2d day of the work in Moscow by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference has ended. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke at the close of the evening session. He replied to notes received from the hall concerning the composition of participants in the debate and Standing Orders. Comrade Gorbachev announced that if yesterday 116 people had registered to take part in the debate, then today there were 206 names on the list of those wishing to take part in the discussion. The need for everyone to strictly abide by Standing Orders and to limit their speech to 15 minutes was once again stressed. Comrade Gorbachev replied to some other questions concerning the conference's work.

Uzbekistan Delegate Holds News Conference

LD2906145388 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—"The programme of the delegation of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan at the all-union party conference is to give vigorous support to

the political course of the CPSU Central Committee of perestroyka, profound economic reform, democratisation of public life and assertion of openness". This was stated today by Rafik Nishanov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, in the press centre of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Nishanov said that the 650,000 party members of this Soviet Central Asian republic had sent to the party conference 178 delegates, among them 36 workers, 44 workers in agriculture, the rest being intellectuals, party and government officials. Before leaving for Moscow every delegate had up to 10 meetings in party organisations and labour collectives during which numerous proposals for the 19th party conference to consider were expressed, Nishanov said.

Asked about a recent publication in the Moscow weekly magazine OGONYOK contending that there were bribetakers among the delegates to the conference, Rafik Nishanov replied: "The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan does not have information than any delegate from our party organisation has compromised himself by accepting bribes".

Touching on the question of guarantees of the nonrepetition in Uzbekistan of the negative phenomena of the 1970s and early 1980s, first of all corruption and crime, Rafik Nishanov said that work was conducted in recent years to assert law and order and Leninist norms of party life, collective leadership and control over the activity of the apparatus. He said that during this time more than 3,000 officials were dismissed and about a hundred of them were put on trial for their crimes. He also said that 18,000 persons were expelled from the Communist Party for having compromised themselves. "But it is wrong to say that corruption in Uzbekistan permeated all sections of society", he stressed. "The bulk of the republic's population are honest working people", Nishanov said.

Replying to journalists, Rafik Nishanov voiced support for the proposal contained in General Secretary Gorbachev's report to nominate as a rule secretaries of party committees to the posts of chairmen of corresponding soviets of people's deputies.

Press Briefed on Conference Proceedings

LD2906194088 Moscow TASS in English 1800 29 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—"Delegates to the conference expressed full agreements with and support for the principle directions of Mikhail Gorbachev's report", Yuriy Sklyarov, head of the press centre of the 19th All-union party conference, stated today at a briefing devoted to the second day of the forum of Soviet Communists.

At the (?same time), he continued, various viewpoints were expressed on separate problems, specificially, on the term of staying in office for elected officials and on a possibility of combining the posts of the first secretary of a party committee and the chairman of a soviet. "On the whole the atmosphere in the hall is businesslike. Delegates react spiritedly to speeches made during the discussion of the report", Sklyarov said.

The head of the press centre acquainted journalists with the (?content) of speeches made by the delegates. He said that 24 people had taken part in the discussion in the past two days. Another 206 are on the list of those who intend to speak in the coming days.

In the course of the party conference delegates decided to adopt a number of resolutions in addition to resolutions on the two main items of the agenda, specifically, on the struggle against [word indistinct], on interethnic relations, on openness (glasnost) and on the law reform. Special commission were [as received] set up for working out those documents, Yuriy Sklyarov said.

Volkogonov Speaks at Conference Press Center

PM3006121588 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 30 Jun 88 p 4

[Report by special correspondents K. Mezentsev, N. Pastukhov, and V. Solovyev: "Unremitting Interest; At the 19th All-Union Party Conference Press Center"]

[Excerpt] The press center's working day begins early in the morning and lasts until late at night. Here is the work schedule just for 29 June. At 0800—a talk between journalists and Colonel General D.A. Volkogonov, chief of the Military History Institute; 1500—delegates from Uzbekistan met with representatives of the world's mass media; 1830—a briefing by press center leader Yu.A. Sklyarov on the results of the second day of the work of the 19th all-union party conference; in the evening—a meeting with delegates from the Tula Oblast party organization and a discussion with writer delegates. And, which is characteristic, there are virtually no empty seats in the auditorium at any of the press conferences.

D.A. Volkogonov, the first to speak on this day, was asked so many questions that more than one day might perhaps have been needed for detailed replies. Indeed, the well known Soviet philosopher, who is now completing work on a two-volume work about I.V. Stalin's political portrait and the time of his rule, wants to satisfy the thirst for knowledge of many Soviet and foreign readers of his documentary book "The Triumph and the Tragedy" ["Triumf i Tragediya"] which is being prepared for publication early next year.

Soviet people's comments on D.A. Volkogonov's articles in the press on the problem of Stalinism have been most extensive and, he told the assembled correspondents, the reaction has not been homogenous. A little over 60 percent of the authors of these missives support the

historian's intent to tell the whole truth about Stalin on the strict basis of authentic documents. Approximately one-third of letters express themselves categorically "against," although from different positions. Well, this reaction probably emphasizes yet again the topicality of and need for the publication of such a work. [passage omitted]

Armenian Delegates Hold News Conference

LD3006100388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0700 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Armenia's delegates met with Soviet and foreign journalists early this morning at the press center of the 19th all-union party conference.

[S. Medvedev, reporter] Most of the questions asked by correspondents revolved around the recent events in Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia. What led to the eruption of the conflict? What ways out of it have been drawn up? What is currently being done to avoid the recurrence of similar events in the future?

Voskanyan, chairman of Armenia's Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Academicians Ambartsumyan and Dzhrbashyan emphasized in their replies that it was not a single cause but a whole range of causes—historical, economic, social, cultural, and legal—at the basis of the conflict. It was noted that a session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet gave its assent to incorporate Nagorno-Karabakh in the republic and that it expressed the hope that this solution of the issue would not affect the centuries' old friendship between the Armenian and Azerbaijani peoples.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Are there other, compromise solutions to this question?

[Voskanyan] I think you will agree with me that this is a very complex question, since two union republics have, in fact, made contradictory decisions. In this situation, what is required from our republics and all of us alike is statesman-like wisdom, in order to resolve this issue in the interests of all our peoples, because we live within a single family of peoples.

Naturally this question lends itself to a solution, so we should find some sort of compromise solution. We are currently thinking about it, having consultations. But we are yet to see what the solution will be. [end recording]

[S. Medvedev] Replying to other questions, speakers noted that the arrangement for overseeing the relations between nationalities, deformed by departures from Leninist principles, has come to be at variance with the present policy in the area of deepening our society's democratic principles of our society. The hope was expressed that much would be done at the current party conference to eliminate this variance.

Party Conference Resumes Work 30 Jun

LD3006063188 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—The 19th National Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) resumed proceedings in the Kremlin today.

The 5,000 or so attending delegates are discussing a report (?delivered on the) first day of the forum Tuesday by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The report outlined a wide-ranging program for overhauling the Soviet political system and ways to promote economic reform.

Gorbachev, Delegate Debate

LD3006111588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] [Announcer] Moscow, the Kremlin, at the 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU—over to our special correspondent:

[Correspondent] Before the start of the third day of the conference's work, all delegates were handed draft conference resolutions. There was intensive work on these drafts and their text on the preceding day, and special commissions were set up for this and even for the composition, for example, of the commission on the internationality. There was a discussion, as a result of which the composition of the commission was noticeably expanded.

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev told delegates yesterday, there were more than 200 people wishing to speak at the conference by the end of yesterday. Well, this number is still growing, and the first today to continue the speeches in the debate was Viktor Ivanovich Postnikov, general director of the Broiler Association of Stavropol Kray. At the very start of his speech he read a note from delegate Grachev for the Presidium, saying that it is necessary to devote more attention at the conference to questions relating to the Food Program. It is the agro-industrial complex of our country that Viktor Ivanovich Postnikov in fact represents. At the very beginning of his speech he put forward a specific proposal.

[Begin Postnikov recording] I put forward the proposal to extend the Law on Cooperatives to all agricultural enterprises, to all associations: That is, to create absolutely uniform conditions for competitive labor, because the law on enterprises which was issued earlier and by which we are guided has compromised itself. There is very little in it that is intelligible, very few guarantees for a socialist enterprise. Democratic management is very poorly discussed. For this reason, I think that there is the possibility of replacing it by the Law on Cooperatives in agriculture, in agriculture for the time being.

Again on cooperatives: Very many of our people spend time abroad. For example, I have just recently returned from the Netherlands. This is a very highly developed country. When one asks: How did you manage on these polders—bad land—to become the primary exporters of agricultural produce in Europe? They always answer with a smile: We were the first to implement your ideas on cooperatives, ideas that were born in your country; meanwhile, you are still talking, and that is why we have good results in agriculture.

Concerning the management of agriculture. We have a concept that has existed for many years already. Yesterday, Comrade Kobaidze said that on financial autonomy, if one switches to it—and he had switched to it—their enterprise does not need a ministry. This, of course, sounds provocative and unusual, but I support this idea. [applause] [end recording]

[Correspondent] Viktor Ivanovich Postnikov also dwelt on the role of the soviets of labor collectives, on the need for the improvement of price-formation. The general director of the association considers it very important that agricultural enterprises produce prepared finished produce, not raw materials. The state should provide incentives and encouragement for this. This is what the delegate said about bureaucracy in our economy.

[Begin recording] [Postnikov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, I think that restructuring is a revolution. You have said that we shall attempt to carry it through calmly, using humane methods. But if this is a revolution, you will not carry it through using such methods. [applause] Exhorting people, and educating them all the time—for example, the bureaucratically minded. After all, we know, that there are many of these people here, too, who are against restructuring, and you will not get anywhere with them. They have to be driven out. They have to be excluded from the party. [applause]

Yet you are a humane individual by nature; we know this, and you want to educate them using these methods. They have to be deprived, quietly pensioned off, and be rid of them. [laughter, applause] I think that the conference will give...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Viktor Ivanovich...

[Postnikov]...you and the Politburo the powers for this.

[Gorbachev] Viktor Ivanovich, Viktor Ivanovich.

[Postnikov] I am listening.

[Gorbachev] Let us have a talk in the presence of witnesses [laughter] on this topic. I think that you have presented Mikhail Sergeyevich as being too simple. [Gorbachev chuckles] I think that if we again start, from the Central Committee, to remove the bureaucrat alongside you in Stavropol Kray, or even in your association, or a bit higher, in the Russian Federation, or wherever; it will not work. That is what happened before in our country. We have tried a lot of things from above. Nothing comes from this.

I think that what we are discussing today...[Gorbachev changes thought] By way of reform, by way of this financial autonomy of which you are speaking; by way of a reform of the political system, by way of an improvement in the spiritual sphere and the involvement of the mass media and public opinion, we shall move the entire society—and then there will be nowhere for the bureaucrat to go. The land will be burning beneath his feet. That, properly speaking, is what he is afraid of. But he will always come to an agreement with the authorities. He will cite, as he has cited for 10 or 20 years in succession, two freight car loads of arguments for you, and in the end you will give up. [laughter]

For this reason, it is not a question of being good, and it is not a question of people being in love with you, so to speak, and liking you. In general, this is pretension in political work; it is an illusion. One has to carry through a political line in the interests of the people, and in the interests of socialism, involving the people themselves in all the processes. The people will quickly put everyone in his place. If we accept the mechanisms which we are discussing today, for example, that is how things will be. [applause]

It is true that they did not support me as warmly as they did you, but all the same... [laughter, applause]

[Postnikov] You have made me change my mind, and for that reason, I end my speech. [laughter, applause] [end recording]

[Correspondent] Well, that is how the discussion is going here. But Venyamin Aleksandrovich Yarin, a lathe operator of the Nizhniy Tagil Metallurgical Combine, then spoke in as firm, convinced, and constructive a manner. Thus, speaking about ecology, for example, he said that a session of the city soviet will be devoted to this question, and right here, from the rostrum of the conference, he invited to this session of the city soviet, the ministers of steel, chemical, and cosntruction materials industries.

Well, this ends our report.

More on Debate

LD30061153 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0700 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] At the 19th all-union party conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses this morning, Viktor Ivanovich Postnikov, general director of Stavropol Kray Broiler Association, was asked to take the floor. Having analyzed the state of affairs in agriculture, Comrade Postnikov went on to say:

[Begin recording] [Postnikov] Concerning agricultural management, there is in our country, a concept, a term that has taken root already. I think that this has been put well in the report: That once cooperatives and lease contracting have been introduced, any sort of management of farming ought to—this word—disappear altogether, in the sense in which we understand it, because lease contracting, cooperatives presuppose only self-management.

Well, yesterday, again, you understood from the conference proceedings, during which words about transferring power to the soviets were voiced time and again, that the enterprise ought to be made more subordinate to the soviets—who else—so that it is not the soviet that goes, hat in hand, to the enterprise, for the soviet ought to command the enterprise.

I think that this should not take place, regardless of the soviets having more power transferred to them: The enterprise ought to exist as an independent entity, self-managed by the people. That is why any democratization in our political system ought to be started from the enterprise, and the enterprise must always be borne in mind.

The soviets do not currently feel too comfortable—their status, as far as the enterprise is concerned, has not been defined. This ought to be brought to a conclusion. Power by the people [narodovlastiye] ought to begin at the enterprise, and then all questions of democratization ought to be solved. [applause]

Now, about financial autonomy, comrades: No matter how much you talk about it—and we do talk a great deal now, in my personal view, for we have been dealing with this issue more than anyone else for 5 years now, since 1983—that as long as no fiscal reform [denezhnaya reforma] has been carried out, financial autonomy will remain illusory and incomplete, and it will not be possible for our economic managers to get to know the delights of this financial autonomy and learn to work at enterprises in a real and cost-conscious manner.

[Gorbachev] Viktor Ivanovich, you have the reform of prices, or fiscal reform in mind?

[Postnikov] Fiscal, wholesale, and retail—all of this ought to go together; this reform ought to be carried out simultaneously.

[Gorbachev] You mean pricing?

[Postnikov] Yes, pricing.

[Gorbachev] Ah, yes, that is what it is.

[Postnikov] I mean, I, too, understand that this is a very difficult and unpopular question. Moreover, newspapers are already anticipating things and are already starting to speak out of turn, saying that, well, the elderly and the retired will be impoverished and so on and so forth. That is to say, they are fanning up the situation so that it is not carried out, so that the 13th, I mean further, so that the end of the 5-year plan is reached. [as heard]

I reckon that for the sake of the business at hand, for the sake of our economy, if we have already decided, it is essential to bring the preparations to a completion without delay. I think that if we all work correctly, the people will understand, all the more so because it is no one's intention to bind the people through retail prices. [applause] [end recording]

Gorbachev 'Invitation to Dialogue' Welcomed

PM3006112788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Special correspondents Yu. Orlik and V. Romanyuk report: "On the Party, Society, and People. IZVESTIYA Special Correspondents Report From the Kremlin"]

[Text] We journalists who are able to directly follow the progress of the party conference and talk to the delegates hot on the heels of events, so to speak, can sense the growing tensions, the acuteness of the discussions, and the clashes of opinions. It was announced at yesterday's evening session that more than 200 people had registered to speak.

The conference is breaking with tradition and working out its own ritual—a democratic ritual. Here is one example of how the hall's behavior and its reaction to speeches have changed. The delegates do not recognize any self-justification or beating around the bush. People must talk to the point and not praise themselves but think, think, and think again about how to rectify matters in our common home and how to deepen restructuring and make it irreversible—that is what people are demanding from those taking the rostrum. Those who avoid direct honest speaking are rewarded with inappropriate applause as a cue to wind up. On the first day, V. Belyaninov, secretary of Moscow party gorkom, "finished" his speech to such applause. On the 2d day the hall also interrupted certain bombastic speeches.

The atmosphere in the hall is part of the atmosphere in which society has been living recently.

We talked with delegates.

"The result of the operation of the political and economic system under socialism should be the people's happiness," was the opinion of S. Fedorov, director of the "Mikrokhirurgiya Glaza" Intersectoral Scientific and Technical Complex. "And the extensive democratic transformations outlined in M.S. Gorbachev's speech aim to do just that. I was particularly struck by the following fact. Almost none of the major administrators and party workers who have spoken over the 2 days have talked about how happy people in their oblasts and krays

have become. Either food supplies have improved or there are more new settlements. But the supreme point of the party's activity is to serve the people."

The delegates included Twice Hero of Socialist Labor I. Ganchev, leader of an installation workers' team at the "Nikopolstroy" Trust. He began by saying how much time has to be wasted in traipsing round offices at various oblast and republic departments.

"That is why M.S. Gorbachev was right to say in the report: If we are going to cut the apparatus, let's go ahead and cut it. We must not allow people to settle into different offices after the cuts—let them go into production, the services sphere, cooperatives, trade, or municipal services. There is a shortage of cadres in these spheres, and in construction too. I can see how many people have been cut in our trust, but not a single chair has been removed—they're all occupied. That's how we're cutting people!"

It was noticeable that certain delegations contained many women. G. Sergeyeva, finisher at the Yerman Wood Processing Combine in Volgograd, said in this regard:

"The question of women has been quite rightly posed at the conference. Proclaiming equality between women and men is not enough. To implement it we must organize domestic life, provide kindergartens for all who need them, and eradicate the shortcomings in the work of trade and the services sphere."

"What's the situation like in your area?" we asked Galina Petrovna.

"We are building housing using economic methods," she said. "but things are not going as fast as we'd like. We are pinning a lot of hope on the new director who was recently elected."

The Volgograd delegation of which G. Sergeyeva is a member has a common concern. For a long time, the city's public has been trying to stop chemical production, which has a pernicious effect on the ecological situation. Recent meetings at central departments have been encouraging. On returning home the delegates will probably be able to report to labor collectives that a decision has been made on this urgent issue.

The Volgograd people found moral support for their position in M.S. Gorbachev's report at the conference. It posed the question thus: We must organize on a major scale real social examinations of scientific, technical, and engineering projects with the participation of the general public. This will make it possible to minimize or even completely rule out the ecological and other costs that could be incurred without controls on the elaboration and implementation of these projects.

Many of the delegates with whom we spoke remarked on the special tone of the report. It was not a set of directive instructions that cannot be discussed, but an invitation to dialogue and proposals submitted for collective consultation. People may disagree with it, dispute it, and advance their own solutions for the difficult problems facing our society.

"For me," E. Klimov, first secretary of the USSR Cinematographers Union Board, said, "the proposal that the first secretaries of the corresponding party committees be recommended for the posts of soviet chairmen is moot. It seems to me that this proposal is somewhat at variance with the need to delineate the functions of party and state organs—a need recognized by our society. We must consider, weigh, and comprehensively discuss this proposal."

We had another meeting. V. Gurzhiy, motor vehicle tire fitter and chairman of the labor collective council at the "Omskshina" Production Association, expressed his impressions of the course of the conference in the following way: The hope that the party conference would work out an effective strategy for deepening restructuring is being justified.

"Personally, as chairman of a labor collective council," Valeriy Vladimirovich said, "I am particularly perturbed by the problems of scientific and technical progress. The report noted that today it is important to master the achievements of the modern stage of progress linked with the development of leading-edge technologies—microelectronics, robotics, information science... It is exceptionally important for our sector too. But this is what happens. Working successfully under the conditions of self-financing and full economic accountability [khozraschet], we have R8 million in our account. We would like to use R7 million this year on the technical development of production, but we could only place orders for R1.5 million."

V. Gurzhiy managed to visit Minister N. Lemayev. He promised to help. But the general point is that it is inefficient to have to traipse from office to office, unable to use your own hard-earned cash.

[IZVESTIYA] You mentioned earlier the hopes produced by the party conference. What do they consist of?

[Gurzhiy] A very constructive examination of the problems of restructuring—both in the report and in delegates' speeches. True, there have also been instances of self-justification, which clearly demonstrated parochial views of the problems of restructuring. [Gurzhiy ends]

The time for the party conference is limited, there is simply no room in the regulations for general musings. It is very important that the hopes of the millions of party members who have sent their authorized representatives to Moscow are justified once again.

Conference Delegates, Guests Interviewed

PM3006103788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1

[Report by special correspondents N. Kozhanov, A. Kolesnichenko, V. Lyubitskiy, O. Mikheyev, and I. Podsvirov: "Assertion of a Businesslike Nature; PRAVDA Special Correspondents Report From Kremlin Palace of Congresses"]

[Text] "If they make the first secretary the head of the Soviet and full-time deputies appear, they will require their own apparatus in addition to the ispolkoms. That is reduction of management staff for you."

"But what do you want? Is it conceivable that a bureaucrat in Russia should be left without work?"

"Really, really! First, they will not make the secretary head of the Soviet, they will elect him (if they do elect him). Second, where did you get the idea the Soviet will not manage without an apparatus?..."

And a few steps from the delegates arguing in a group another no less heated dialogue erupts....

In the breaks between sessions it is hot in the spacious foyers of the Palace of Congresses, although the air conditioners are working perfectly. The heat comes from the disputes, the clash of opinions, and arguments. The debates readily spill over beyond the walls of the palace. They are continued by the delegates on the ancient cobbled squares. They can be heard above the steep slope of the green Kremlin hill, where the air is pervaded with the subtle aroma of freshly cut grass and in the shady alleys of the old-fashioned garden where, in our time, sitting on a bench and seemingly listening, Vladimir Ilich Lenin, modeled by a sculptor, looks down thoughtfully and sternly.

The focus of attention, of course, is the report, the keen questions raised in it, the scope and complexity of the forthcoming deeds. How to reinforce and accelerate the process of revolutionary transformations initiated by the Central Committee 1985 Plenum, the course set by the 27th party congress? What must be done to overcome the delaying forces, to reveal and eliminate the main causes of delay? It is from these positions that the delegates are assessing every speech from the conference platform. Is it working for restructuring, does it contain fresh, unaccustomed ideas? Or, as in former times, is it verbosely marking time in self-reporting figures and despondently enumerating forms and methods which are being practised... In the latter case the audience's reaction is immediate—ironic applause is a warning to lovers of empty phrases.

"I think that for some people this will also be a good lesson after the conference," is the opinion of Nikolay Sinelnikov, leader of a team of tunnelers at the "Kizelugol" association's "Tayezhnaya" mine. "It is now time for everyone to work out that the people expect from the conference not more declarations but business, expressed in specific decisions. And above all economic decisions."

"Yes, so far the advances in the sociopolitical atmosphere have been far more noticeable than changes in the economy," Sinelnikov's fellow countrymen, V. Fedonyuk, a worker from the "Kamkabel" plant, joins in the conversation. "So far we lack a really businesslike approach."

During one break we asked several delegates how they understand a businesslike approach in the light of what is being said from the conference platform.

Two envoys of the Donbass working people with whom we talked as it were personify the alliance of the working class and peasantry. Both are in the Kremlin for the first time. V. Ovsyannikov is a tunnelers' team leader at the "Krasnolimanskaya" mine and I. Maltsev is a machine operator at the Suvorov Kolkhoz, Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayon.

"The hammer and the sickle have a common destiny," Maltsev says. "They cannot live a day without each other but together they can overcome any difficulties. But it is not a businesslike approach when we have to overcome difficulties which we create ourselves. I think the main task of the party conference is to elaborate and approve absolutely precise steps which will clear the way for genuine economic reform and genuine democratization and give the soviets real power."

"And so far that does not exist," V. Ovsyannikov noted. "I am a Krasnoarmeysk City Soviet deputy and I am well aware that our soviet seems to have power, but in fact there are no means or levers for implementing it. For instance, the 'Krasnoarmeyskaya-Zapadnaya' mine, the largest in the association, is being built in our region and should have been commissioned this year. But scarcely any housing or sociocultural establishments are being constructed for the miners and their families. How much talk there has been about this, but there are no changes. If the city soviet were vigorous, surely it would not allow this? A businesslike approach on the part of the soviets is inconceivable if there is no real opportunity to defend the rights of the people living on their territory."

And here is the opinion of the writer G. Yushkov, a delegate from Komi republic:

"A businesslike approach today determines the destiny of restructuring. For my small northern people one of the most important questions is the ending of the many years of diktat of sectors extracting natural resources—oil and gas, timber and coal, everything in which our region is rich. Continuing to swear by gross output, the ministries are wringing everything they can from nature's storehouse without thinking about what will remain for our children and grandchildren, without

creating the necessary working, living, and leisure conditions for those now working in the mines, on the oilfields, and in the timber procurement establishments. Restructuring will not take place without relying on strong local soviets which wield real power and defend the working people's interests."

One distinguishing feature of the conference: In addition to the delegates many representatives of the public have been invited to it. They include the authors of articles on complex economic and moral problems which have generated heated arguments and debates—T. Zaslavskaya, D. Likhachev, A. Nuykin, G. Popov, N. Shmelev, the poet Ye. Yevtushenko, the playwrights M. Shatrov and A. Gelman, the writers V. Rasputin and V. Astafyev....

"As for a businesslike approach," Viktor Petrovich said, "as an example, I have no special optimism so far. The report mentions that Vologda Oblast, with which a great deal in my life is linked, has recently even reduced agricultural production output. Nor could it be otherwise, probably. No sensible workers remain in the countryside, the land has become overgrown with weeds. Administrative arbitrariness has resulted in calamity. But have prose writers and journalists, the so-called 'village prose' writers, not fought against the peasantry's alienation from the land and for the careful conservation of folk traditions? How they have fought. The only pity is that little attention is paid to our voice by those from whom authoritative decisions and all kinds of bureaucratic instructions and edicts have issued. And even now, to judge by some speeches, they are not very anxious to heed us."

"But the time has now come for different, more sensible decisions," V. Astafyev continues. "We must descend from the skies onto the sinful land, approaching man himself directly."

"Will you speak at the conference?"

"I am after all a nonparty person and I am present as a guest. Although I take to heart everything which the Communists are saying here."

The question of the role and responsibility of the mass media was frequently raised during discussion at the conference. It was to be heard in the speeches delivered by delegates V. Kalashnikov, V. Karpov, and M. Ulyanov and the replies of the Central Committee general secretary.... The debate is gathering momentum. The list of those who want to speak already includes 206 people and it has not yet been closed. Angry notes were sent to the Presidium at the evening session. Their authors were dissatisfied with the excessive organization and what seems to them to be the selection of "staff" speakers and they ask why on the first two days workers and kolkhoz members have been given almost no change to speak. The comments have been taken into account. In addition the conference delegates are demanding that the speakers talk about the thrust of the problems and put an end once and for all to the unseemly practice of complacent self reports. And in his speech F. Popov, first secretary of the Altay party Kraykom, suggested that the Mandate Commission explain how justified was the assertion of the authors of an article in OGONEK that the party conference delegates include several people involved in bribery. The proposal was accepted. There is a rally businesslike atmosphere in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. The all-union party conference is continuing its work.

Writers Denounce 'Establishment' Speakers

LD3006051888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 30 Jun 88

[From the "PRAVDA review"]

[Text] Today PRAVDA carries reports from its special correspondents from the Kremlin's Palace of Congresses. In between sessions, they write, it is hot in the spacious foyer of the Palace of Congresses, although the air conditioning is working properly. The heat comes from the disputes, clashes of opinions, and arguments. The debate easily flows beyond the palace walls. The delegates continue them on the cobblestones of the ancient squares. They are heard over the steep slopes of the green Kremlin hill, and in the shady lanes of the old garden.

At the center of attention is, of course, the report. Acute questions are contained in it—the scope and complexity of the coming achievements; how to underpin and accelerate the process of the revolutionary transformations started by the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the course set out by the 27th party congress; what must be done to overcome the forces of deceleration, to expose and eliminate its main causes. It is from precisely these standpoints that the delegates are appraising every speech from the conference rostrum, the paper's correspondents stress.

A distinguishing characteristic of the conference is that apart from the delegates, there are many representatives of the public invited to it. They include the authors of articles on complex problems of economics and morality that have caused ardent disputes and discussions, Zaslavskaya, Likhachev, (Muykin), Popov, Shmelev; the poet Yevtushenko; playwrights Shatrov and Gelman; writers Rasputin and Afanasyev.

The question of the media's role and responsibility has been raised more than once in conference discussions. It was heard in the speechs by delegates Kalashnikov, Karpov, Ulyanov, and in the rejoinders by the Central Committee general secretary. The discussions are gaining pace. There are already 206 on the list of people wanting to speak, and the line has not yet been drawn.

At the evening session angry notes were sent to the presidium. The writers are displeased with the organization and selection, as they see it, of establishment speakers, and ask why it is that in the first 2 days workers and collective farmers have virtually not been invited to speak. These remarks have been taken into consideration.

In the Kremlin Palace of Congresses there is a truly business-like mood. That is how the report from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—entitled: Affirmation of Efficiency—concludes.

Businesslike Spirit Seen at Conference
LD2906140988 Moscow TASS in English 1329 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—TASS correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

Speakers do not always rejoice at the applause, heard from time to time at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, where the All-Union CPSU Conference is under way. Sometimes the applause signifies not the approval of the audience, but the warning for one not to utter general words, not to be engaged in self-reporting. Such warnings to some speakers, still prevailed over by the tradition of the past years, came more than once, both today and yesterday.

This is one of the indicators of the businesslike spirit reigning at the forum of the Soviet Communists which has been in the Kremlin for the second day. Speeches made from the rostrum of the conference are as a rule concrete, critical and contain interesting ideas.

General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, who delivered a report at the conference yesterday, invited the delegates to have a comprehensive discussion of the most important problems of further development of the party and the state, deepening and expansion of perestroyka. Such a comparison of positions is under way at the Palace of Congresses.

The report, for instance, put forward the idea of certification of the party members, which is bound to lead to purification of the CPSU ranks. Delegate Vladimir Smirnov, a worker from Leningrad, declared against certification, considering it untimely.

Different viewpoints are expressed also in connection with the proposal to nominate first secretaries of territorial party committees of the CPSU to elective offices of chairmen of soviets of people's deputies. First secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union, delegate Vladimir Karpov believes that this will be useful and correct. While director of the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, delegate Leonid Abalkin is doubtful as to a correctness of such practices, considering the need for dividing the functions of party and state bodies.

Delegates also view differently the question of how long one can hold an elective office. Director of the Institute of the U.S. and Canadian Studies, delegate Georgiy Arbatov proposed that the time of office in such offices should be strictly limited to two five-year terms. And chairman of the Union of Theatre Workers of the Russian Federation, delegate Mikhail Ulyanov, said that, as a rule, one person should be elected only for one term. To be elected for the second term it is necessary for one to have not simple majority of votes but 75 per cent majority, Mikhail Ulyanov believes.

In short, the discussion at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses is in full swing. The businesslike and democratic spirit of the party conference is an earnest that its delegates will jointly reach correct decisions expected from them by the party and the public as a whole.

New Sakhalin Oblast Group Attends Conference
LD2906112888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2100 GMT 28 Jun 88

[Text] Among the delegates of the Communists, indeed of all the working people, which the delegates to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference have taken with them to Moscow from Sakhalin Oblast, there are many proposals voiced by members of a new voluntary organization. It was founded in Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk and is known to the natives of the area under the title Democratic Movement for Restructuring [Demokraticheskoye Dvizheniye za Perestroyku].

People of different professions and ages, together with local party and soviet bodies, have outlined a specific program of action for rectifying major shortcomings incurred in the development of democracy and glasnost in Sakhalin, and in the resolution of social and ecological issues. Such an association of forces will better serve the cause of restructuring in various spheres of life in the large island oblast.

Yazov Receives Military Delegates to Conference
LD2706185888 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A meeting took place in Moscow today between Comrade Yazov, USSR minister of defense, and the delegations of the Army and fleets to the 19th all-union party conference.

Zaykov Comments on Restructuring, Conference
AU3006094588 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 27 Jun 88 p 3

[Interview with CPSU Politburo Member Lev Zaykov, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, by Peter Dunai: "Lev Zaykov Gives Interview to NEPSZABADSAG on Restructuring, Obstacles, and on the Party Conference That Starts Tomorrow"; date and place not given]

[Text] In an interview given to our correspondent, Lev Zaykov spoke about the preparations for the 19th CPSU conference due to start on 28 June and on the current phase of restructuring.

[Dunai] You are also a delegate to the 19th CPSU conference. If you take the floor at the meeting, what will you say?

[Zaykov] We, Moscow delegates, will have a lot to say. First of all, we shall say that Moscow firmly supports the strategic guideline of the Central Committee, a guideline for the deepening of the socialist people's power in all areas of our public life. We support the style of restructuring worked out by the party, namely, the immediate practical utilization of newly developed concepts. This shows that the party is the driving force behind the revolutionary renewal of socialism.

Second, the experiences gained in democratization and in a new way of management during the last 3 years of restructuring are regarded with interest in Moscow. During this time, the Moscow party committee had to conduct a tough struggle against the conservatism that characterized the period of stagnation as well as against the "left-wing" haste. The workers here in Moscow were not misled by manifestations of demagogy, extremism, nationalism, and pseudo-patriotism either. The ideology of renewal is increasingly gaining ground among Moscow's citizens. They are learning with increasing self-confidence how to work under conditions of socialist democracy and widening glasnost.

Finally: We have our proposals and practical work program to submit to the party conference, proposals which we worked out on the basis of the aforementioned experiences and of the CPSU Central Committee Theses. Election of the delegates to the party conference, the debate on their nomination, and the discussion of the CPSU Theses took place in the framework of open party meetings that covered the entire city and which provided an opportunity to supplement the party conference draft document with a substantial package of proposals.

[Dunai] How did the election of delegates take place?

[Zaykov] In connection with the convening of the 19th party conference, several political and organizational issues had to be solved in a new way. The CPSU Plenum of June 1987 decided that the delegates must be elected by secret ballot at county, border area, and republican central committee party plenums, without any interference from "above." The main goal was to elect the real and active supporters of restructuring and the most eminent members of the party as delegates to the party conference.

Election in the Spirit of Glasnost [subhead]

Here, in Moscow, we strove to elect our delegates in the spirit of openness, thoroughly analyzing the opinions of Communists and working collectives. Nomination of candidates and personnel debates took place in open party meetings where the most suited people were selected from among several candidates. Some 900 basic party organization meetings and 4,000 enterprise nomination meetings were held in Moscow. In addition to his professional and moral values, we analyzed each candidate's personal contribution to the restructuring process. We had a total of 3,000 candidates, and several people were considered in every second nomination.

In the majority of collectives, nominations were carried out in accordance with the aforementioned principles. In many basic party organizations, comrades whom the enterprise party organization supported did not receive the majority votes because, although they had achieved good production results, they had not prove themselves sufficiently in the period of restructuring.

We did not succeed in avoiding formalism and exaggerated organization in this important activity. In some party organizations, the members expected instructions from above, as was the old way. Thus, they lost time and were unable to organize a broad debate. The press was right in criticizing these snortcomings.

As a whole, I would like to point out that many active and really prestigious fighters for restructuring were considered during nominations and the personal debates on candidates. It is clear that we could not elect every worthy party member. The CPSU Plenum of June 1987 decided that one delegate to the conference would represent 3780 party members. Some 5,000 delegates were elected. Many of those who were not elected as delegates have been invited to the conference as guests.

[Dunai] Will you publish the entire list of delegates prior to the conference?

[Zaykov] The list has already been published in the local party committee forums where these delegates were elected. For example, two dailies in Moscow published the entire list of Moscow delegates.

[Dunai] How will the press be informed about the conference? How many days will it last? Will there be closed sessions, and can we expect personnel changes in the leading bodies of the party?

[Zaykov] Special television and radio programs will provide detailed summaries on each day of the conference. The press will publish the report and the delegates' speeches. The delegates will decide themselves on issues related to the activity of the conference, for example, the duration of debates. The agenda of the conference does not contain debates on personnel issues.

[Dunai] What are the main issues to be debated at the conference?]

[Zaykov] The agenda of the 19th national party conference was adopted by the CPSU Plenum of June 1987 and is as follows: 1. Implementation of the decisions of the

19th CPSU Congress, implementation of the first half of the 12th 5-year plan, its basic particularities and the party organizations' tasks in deepening the process of restructuring.

2. Measures aimed at the further democratization of the party and society.

The CPSU Plenum of May 1988 decided to publish the Theses for the 19th party conference worked out by the Central Committee and to enable a broad debate of the Theses with the participation of all the workers.

The Theses comprise the restructuring process under way in our country, a process aimed at revealing the humane nature and creative power of socialism. This can be achieved only if we develop democracy, openness, and the people's self-management, and if we carry out a radical economic reform, opening thus the way to the development of a creative power inherent in man's free and multilateral development. Today, people call this restructuring process revolutionary.

One Should Work, Not Wait for a Miracle! [subhead]

The Theses reflect the theoretical and practical search of 3 years of restructuring and its political consequences, and the Theses continue working out the theory and policy of a comprehensive and radical renewal that covers all spheres of society. In this endeavor, the Theses rely on the 27th CPSU Congress and on the CPSU Plenum of April 1985 and the subsequent plenums.

The Theses are the result of a collective work carried out by the active fighters of the party and of the restructuring process. The Theses also take into consideration the opinions appearing in the press and in the form of letters and speeches, opinions expressed during debates on the road of further developing the socialist society and the party's activity under the new circumstances.

The task of the party conference is to thoroughly analyze the course of the restructuring process, to give a new and strong impetus to this process, and to create political, economic, and organizational conditions that will guarantee the irreversibility of restructuring and democratization and which will enable the development and deepening of these processes.

One can also come across concepts of waiting for a miracle, namely that everything will change overnight with the conference. However, there are no miracles in social development. The conference will work out the plan for our social transformation, and all of us will have to implement this in practice with strong work.

[Dunai] Opposition to restructuring is often mentioned nowadays. Who, and what forces oppose restructuring? Does it not cause concern that a high percentage of delegates belong to the party apparatus?

[Zaykov] All our cadres, the party, and the people are now facing completely new problems, phenomena, and processes, and this has created a new situation. We saw that not everyone, by far, is ready to correctly evaluate the current situation. There is simply confusion prevailing in many people's heads. There are also people who are bitter or in panic.

In my view, conservatism is the main factor that hinders restructuring. The forces behind this conservatism are those that must give up their current life style because of restructuring, people who cannot, or do not want to give up their dogmatic concepts about socialism. One can, of course, also come across nationalist and chauvinist views among those who hinder this process. However, in my view, the major achievement of the first phase of restructuring is that the Soviet people are increasingly supporting the revolutionary transformation that is under way in the USSR.

The staff of the apparatus have been often and rightly criticized lately, but I do not agree with those who consider all of them as opponents of restructuring or list them only among the second or third line of supporters.

Every Fourth Moscow Delegate Is a Worker [subhead]

It is a fact that many members of the central party apparatus, the state bodies, and of foreign affairs and other leading bodies have been elected as delegates. These people were nominated at the party committee plenums in the same way as all the other candidates. In the majority of cases, the proposals on the nomination of these people met with the members' approval.

Candidates were also nominated from among the leaders. These nominations reflected the evaluation and positions of public opinion. I think this is a natural and democratic process of obvious importance.

Finally, let me mention a few examples from Moscow. The Moscow party committee elected 319 delegates. Without the city party committee secretaries, four of these are members of the city party apparatus. (There were eight members at the 27th CPSU Congress). Every fourth Moscow delegate is a worker. The other 25 percent of the delegates come from the areas of culture, science, public education, and health.

[Dunai] What specific proposals and observations reached the Moscow party committee during the debate on the party conference theses?

[Zaykov] We had received 134,000 proposals by 17 June. We established special working groups at the district and town party committees to deal with these proposals. The majority of observations and proposals referred to the development of socialist democracy, the expansion of glasnost, and to the separation of party and state functions.

Many people who submitted proposals are concerned about the qualitative composition of the party, the expansion of its membership, and the role of the vanguard made up of Communists. The proposals discuss the need to increase the demands from those who enter the party so that people who get into the party are convinced fighters for the implementation of the goals set out in the party program.

The broad debate on the party conference Theses and the great interest in them shows that the population firmly supports the restructuring initiated by the party.

Moscow Gorkom Plenum Seen as 'Dress Rehearsal'
PM2306114288 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 24, 12 Jun 88 p 3

[Yegor Yakovlev "Political Diary" article: "On the Eve"]

[Text] The Plenary Meeting of the Moscow City Party Committee which elected 319 delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference (292 Communists, including Mikhail Gorbachev, elected unanimously) has opened the "last lap in the race": the Conference will open this month.

The exchange of views at the Plenary Meeting was highly characteristic of our Party's and all our society's life today. Participants in the Plenary Meeting concentrated on the issue of electing delegates to the Conference, an issue which has preoccupied many people of late. Some give facts confirming that the election of delegates was democratic. Others say the opposite: Bureaucrats from the Party again won victory. Distrust of functionaries by the bulk of Communists, taking shape over the years, made itself felt. The latter feared that the functionaries would fool them as far as democracy was concerned. And the functionaries were sure that without their instructions nobody worthwhile would be elected to the Conference. The delegates include quite a few elected strictly on the basis of their post—there are such people also in the Moscow list of delegates (isn't that why MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA neglected to mention where these delegates work and what post they occupy?). Meanwhile among the 12 "zealous advocates of perestroyka"—L. Zaykov, First Secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, gave the list of their names—only four were honoured with being elected as Conference delegates.

For any examples there are more than enough facts. But speaking about this phenomenon, the present generation of Communists has not known such elections. They were accompanied by unprecedented activity of Party members and non-Party people. Many thousands of people in Moscow signed the letter saying that the mandates of the Conference should be granted to the most active representatives of the capital's intelligentsia. In Omsk 7,000 people who assembled at the stadium on their own initiative discussed the practice of nominating candidates for election as delegates. In Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk a spontaneous meeting deprived of trust the First Secretary of the Regional Party Committee already elected to the Conference. Candidates for delegates were nominated without any instructions and in the course of events the election procedure was determined. As a matter of fact, it was the overflow of democratic creative work of the masses, which in its revolutionary principle can be compared with the creation of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies. The practice of electing deputies to the 19th Party Conference determines, to a large extent, what will happen tomorrow. Today Communists and non-Party people are defending for the first time their candidates, and tomorrow, when it is time to elect delegates to the 28th Party Congress, they will know how to act better.

The Plenary Meeting of the Moscow Party Committee is a kind of a dress rehearsal for the future Conference, having in mind the free exchange of views and unbiassed discussion of the most unexpected issues. Newspapers have already written about this. But I would like to look at it a little differently and as one of the participants in this meeting, ask myself: Did I take advantage of the opportunities given me, did I express everything that seemed to be important, did I share my doubts? Why, for example, were most questions and demands addressed to the same "ardent advocates of perestroyka"—Abalkin, Afanasyev and Klimov? And the discussion focussed on what Mikhail Gorbachev had stressed before: electing active supporters of perestroyka to the Conference.

No, I did not speak out and did not ask. Why? Most probably because the chains of the past weigh heavily on us and we are not accustomed to demanding the floor and are still waiting for someone to come and offer it to us. But in that way one can "wait" for the entire 19th Party Conference. I think that the responsibility of its delegates is not only to collect, as fully as possible, the proposals of those who have elected them. It is necessary that all this be reported to the Conference, be included in its work and maximum results be sought.

The Plenary Meeting also discussed the efficiency of debates. Some participants suggested that by applying labels we are returning to the times which we are trying with such difficulty to get rid of—an example of this was shown, regrettably, at this meeting too. The candidature of playwright A. Gelman was discussed. Excited by this fact, Z. Korshunova, Director of the Institute of Party History of the Moscow City and Moscow Regional Party Committee, said: Gelman cannot be a delegate of the Conference since he wrote an article in OGONEK against the Party and its guiding role. With reference to Gelman, all this seemed incredible: in his plays he defended perestroyka long before it was launched, his present-day contributions to the press are examples of Party exactingness. Mikhail Gorbachev was surprised together with the others. He threw up his hands as if asking: How far has it gone? He spoke of Gelman as a serious, modest and highly gifted person. What article in OGONEK was meant by Korshunova? No article at all.

"I was mistaken," she told me and this time she said the truth. Gelman has never published any article in that magazine. As for wordings used by Korshunova, they show that among us there are many people who feel nostalgia for the bygone times, who do not wish to go against the principles which plunged the country into a crisis....

A couple of weeks are left before the opening of the 19th Party Conference on which so many hopes and anxieties, forecasts and expectations are pinned.

'Controversial' Conference Demands Published

PM2306120788 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 88 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Your Position? Continuing the Discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th Party Conference"]

[Text] A debate was held last Sunday at Moscow Youth Palace with the assistance of the Moscow Komsomol Gorkom. Over 500 people—representatives of independent youth associations and political clubs—discussed the CPSU Central Committee Theses. Yu.N. Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow Historical Archives Institute and conference delegate for the Moscow party organization, participated in the conversation. The young social scientists' "Democratic Restructuring" club handed him its mandate. We give an account today of some of the proposals. Some of the attitudes expressed by the young academics may appear controversial. The editorial board does not share all of them either. But a debate presupposes not only controversial opinions. What, then, does the "Democratic Restructuring" club propose?

"...Create political mechanisms and guarantees which will preclude the possibility of a future violation of the Leninist principles of the party leadership of society..." (CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, point No 5).

Party work must be implemented mainly on a voluntary basis. Debates are to be envisaged before very important Central Committee plenums, conferences, and congresses. Congress and conference delegates should be nominated on the basis of their positions and programs.

A USSR law should be prepared on party activity, envisaging that the party should not have any authoritative functions outside the party itself, that the party tries to implement its political line only through communists working in organs of power, state institutions, and public organizations. Every citizen has the right to appeal through the courts against the actions of party leaders in the event of their exceeding their authority. It is necessary to establish guarantees of party and other organs' noninterference in the activity of judicial and legal bodies. The rights of party and nonparty citizens—including the right to choose a profession and hold posts—must be made equal in practice. All nomenklatura personnel's privileges are to be eliminated.

"The transfer to the soviets of full power from the bottom to the top..." (point No 6)

Elections to soviets are to be held in multiseat districts. Advance information is to be provided on contenders' programs and personal qualities. During the election campaign candidates are to be protected against obstacles to campaigning among the voters and to their expressing views that do not contradict constitutional norms. There is to be free nomination of candidates, without restrictions on numbers. Any group of citizens can nominate a candidate. Independent monitoring of the voting process is essential.

"The priority measures of the legal reform include the radical enhancement of the role of justice..." (point No. 8).

Real independence of judges is to be ensured at all levels. Judicial organs' spheres of action should not coincide with administrative and territorial divisions. Party organizations for judges who are party members are to be formed, which will be directly subordinate to the party congress (to the Central Committee between congresses); the judiciary is to be formed by decision of the Supreme Court or Supreme Judicial Council; supreme court judges are to be appointed from among representatives of juridical science who have demonstrated their competence. People's assessor membership of panels of judges is to be increased. The college of people's assessors is to be given the exclusive right to pass guilty verdicts. The practice of closed legislation (unpublished decrees, instructions, and so forth) is to be abolished, except in cases envisaged by the Law on State Secrecy. An attorney general's service is to be set up, incorporating a system of civil rights attorneys.

Standing commissions on internal affairs and state security are to be set up at soviets. A system is to be introduced whereby the USSR MVD and the USSR KGB compulsorily report back to soviets. The KGB is to be turned into a body dealing mainly with safeguarding the country's external security.

"There is a need in the immediate future to define the legal basis of the activity of public organizations, voluntary societies, and self-motivated associations..." (point No 9)

Citizens can set up any public organizations as long as their aims and activities do not contradict the Constitution—this principle must be enshrined in the law on public organizations.

Young people's interests in the political, scientific, and artistic spheres must be implemented through various clubs and associations and also through independent public political organizations. They should all be granted the widest possible rights, including the right of representation on the USSR Committee of Youth Organizations. Everything must

be done to develop young people's independence in adopting various decisions, ensuring that they have the right to defend their own interests against any state body. A Students' Union is to be set up to represent the interests of Soviet student youth.

"...Show constant concern for strengthening the guarantees of Soviet people's rights and freedoms." (point No 8).

It is necessary to lift restrictions on citizens' movements about the country and abroad, without loss of citizenship rights. Every Soviet citizen must have the right to choose where he lives. The points in the "Regulations on the USSR Identity Card System" connected with registration of abode are to be revoked. A gradual move is to be made toward abolition of the identity card system altogether. There is to be public monitoring of the performance of military service.

The development of glasnost must be guaranteed. A Law on the Press is to be elaborated and adopted after nationwide discussion.

"The correct organization of relations between local soviets and labor collective councils is acquiring special significance" (point No 6).

We propose convening local, republic, and all-union congresses of representatives of labor collectives' councils to discuss and solve fundamental socioeconomic questions.

A National Economic Council of Labor Collectives is needed. It would help involve working people in actual management processes. The decisions of congresses of labor collectives' councils could be submitted for examination by soviets.

Roy Medvedev on CPSU Conference Prospects

PM2806091688 Barcelona LA VANGUARDIA in Spanish 22 Jun 88 p 6

[Interview with Soviet historian Roy Medvedev by Rafael Poch in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpt] [Introductory passage omitted] [Poch] Do you not believe that there is much confusion regarding restructuring?

[Medvedev] Yes. There is no clear theory of restructuring—no predetermined plan to be implemented. It entails a great deal of improvisation, of things that emerge overnight. This is a peculiarity of every revolution—a word that Gorbachev applies to restructuring. Lenin, too, had no plan when the October Revolution took place. He liked Napoleon's saying that "first you must join the fray and then see what to do in it." There is a general trend toward making our society wealthier, more just, and more democratic, with more freedom for culture and less bureaucracy. In this endeavor, many problems have emerged for which the leadership was not even prepared.

The national conflicts in the Caucasus are one problem. Nagorno-Karabakh, a small region which the Politburo members had never even heard of before, is a very serious problem for the government, perhaps even greater than Chernobyl, and nobody knows how to resolve it. There are many other focuses of social dissatisfaction—in Kazakhstan, Sakhalin, and Yaroslavl, the Baltic coast—economic problems that nobody expected. The struggle against alcoholism has created great dissatisfaction among the people because sugar is disappearing from the stores, drug addiction is increasing, and the leaders are often at a loss.

Because of the criticism of Stalin, teachers now do not know how to teach history, and it has been decided to suspend history examinations. University and school students are creating their own organizations, informal groups—of which some 50,000 have appeared—with the most varied programs. The situation is different in every part of the country. For instance, while restructuring has resolute supporters in Estonia, where a People's Front has been created to support it, in Lithuania, the Catholic Church has stepped up its work, and the struggle for restructuring is expressed throughout the extension and expansion of believers' rights. Totally different situations exist in Armenia and Azerbaijan: Islamic extremism is surfacing in the latter republic. While in Armenia demonstrators carry portraits of Lenin and Gorbachev, in Azerbaijan, they carry photographs of Khomeyni and Ismailov—one of those sentenced in connection with the Sumgait disturbances. In some regions party secretaries support conservative tendencies and in others, those in favor of restructuring. We are in a period of some uncertainty, which seems characteristic of the transition from an almost totalitarian to an almost democratic state.

Intellectual Freedom [subhead]

[Poch] The reform is having a much greater impact in terms of glasnost—everything to do with intellectual freedom—than in terms of the democratization of the system or the economy. Can the conference unblock the situation in these two fields?

[Medvedev] Obviously restructuring is developing unevenly and is progressing more in the cultural field. Our literature, for instance, has changed radically. We have seen the publication of works by dead authors or by emigres that have not been published for 20, 30, or 40 years, and many journals function without censorship.

It is more difficult in the economy. First, because people are not ready for it—not only engineers or enterprise managers but also the workers, who are expected to work harder and to better standards. They are accustomed to doing bad work for low wages. However, they prefer to earn little and to work less hard. Therefore, there is a certain split within the working class and among the peasants. Nevertheless, there are many who are willing to work hard and well and to receive good pay for it. We have seen that very few enterprise managers are capable of achieving what the new situation permits them to do.

Previously, the work was bureaucratic but calm. Now they are being told: "Show your autonomy, your enterprise, and your initiative; you can trade with other countries; we will provide you with currency...." However, they do not know how to do these new and very complicated things.

Furthermore, technological standards are very low. We do not have a school of economists that can formulate a new model, and we lack even a proper knowledge of what is called economic science. We are very poorly acquainted with the Western economy's achievements. We must change all systems of credit, distribution, supply, trade.... This all demands not only voluntaristic decisions but also a scientific foundation, and we are very unprepared for it.

[Poch] Does the antialcohol campaign not conflict with the principle of the "primacy of economic over administrative methods" that you have talked about?

[Medvedev] This campaign shows that it is very difficult to achieve any result with administrative methods. Regarding wines, for instance, this campaign has caused terrible damage to wine-producing regions such as Moldavia and Georgia. The removal of vines has caused dissatisfaction among the peasants and has occurred in the very regions where there is the least alcoholism. Now it has been decided not to decrease but to increase grape production and to reduce production of artificial wines and increase that of grape wines. The question of spirits is being discussed because it has been shown that it is very easy to produce them at home. It has been seen that alcohol consumption has increased through moonshining, and it now emerges that the revenue lost by the state is being pocketed by speculators.

[Poch] We previously mentioned the CPSU conference. What is your opinion about the Central Committee's conference Theses?

[Medvedev] Even before the conference, the public debate has far transcended the confines of the Theses. Most people believe that they are inadequate. They embody two general principles: socialist pluralism, that is, democracy on a socialist basis—and the majority of people believe that pluralism must have a much broader meaning—and, in general, permission for the expression of critical opinions.

Otherwise, Soviet Communists would find it impossible to maintain a debate with other ideological groups. This has become apparent in connection with visits by certain foreign leaders to Moscow, for instance, with President Reagan's interview on Soviet television. I witnessed the President's meeting with 40 prominent Soviet intellectuals at the writers' center during the recent summit. Reagan was the most convincing speaker, and even Writers Union Secretary Karpov admitted that if it had been a competition, the President would have won first prize.

Innovative Theses [subhead]

[Poch] The theses are very innovative from a doctrinal viewpoint, however...

[Medvedev] Obviously they are very different from those published at previous congresses, but to many people they now seem inadequate. They would like a more radical document that fully broaches the problems of concern to the population, but the party lacks the intellectual powers to resolve these issues. Throughout this movement, there is an element of spontaneity for which our apparatus is unprepared. It has an authoritarian structure that cannot adapt to a movement arising from the grassroots.

[Poch] Do you believe that the conference will alter the Central Committee's composition?

[Medvedev] Yes. Over 70 Central Committee members have lost the right to remain members, having been dismissed from posts entailing membership of that body. However, nobody knows how the change will take place.

[Poch] What chances do you see of an extraordinary congress being convened?

[Medvedev] There have been several proposals to this effect, including one that the conference be made a congress, but I cannot say much about this except that I personally expect some surprises.

[Poch] There are currently two lines within the CPSU leadership with regard to reform. Does one of them have to prevail, or is a compromise possible?

[Medvedev] One of the two must prevail, but this does not entail the other's elimination: Some kind of compromise must occur. Only a small sector of the most conservative elements will be withdrawn because most people, if told "either you support restructuring or you are out," would prefer to start changing how they work. This is precisely Gorbachev's line because there are very few new people willing to work in the new style, which is why Gorbachev has to use whoever can still be used.

[Poch] This is what he wants, but perhaps he is also obliged to do so....

[Medvedev] Yes. Gorbachev is changing as much as he can. This is not so with Ligachev, who is not acting. As time has passed, Gorbachev has displayed his ability in both foreign and domestic policy. Apart from the changes permitted to him by the process itself, he is acquiring experience along the way. What is his personal capacity to forge ahead? I do not know.